

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1870.

ART. I.—DE GROOT ON Gnostic TESTIMONIES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[ARTICLE FIRST.]

Basilides am Ausgang des Apostolischen Zeitalters, als erster Zeuge für Alter und Autorität Neutestamentlicher Schriften, insbesondere des Evangeliums Johannes, in Verbindung mit anderen Zeugen bis zur Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Von P. HOFSTEDER DE GROOT, Dr. der Theol. und Prof. in der Univ. zu Gröningen Deutsche vermehrte Ausgabe. Leipzig. 1868.

WHEN Dr. De Groot translated into Dutch the little work of Tischendorf, "When were our Gospels Written?" he was led to a critical examination of the "patristic literature so far as it affords us insight into the first century and the first half of the second." The results of this investigation he published in Dutch, and afterward enlarged his work and republished it in German, under the title indicated at the head of this article: "Basilides at the Close of the Apostolic Age, as the First Witness for the Antiquity and Authority of the New Testament Writings, especially of the Gospel of John, in Connection with other Testimonies till the Middle of the Second Century." Dr. De Groot dedicates his work to Tischendorf as furnishing *new* proof of the genuineness of the Gospels, and in his notes he replies to the work of Dr. Scholten * which was directed against Tischendorf.

One of the most important works for establishing the genu-

* For an account of Dr. Scholten's work see Methodist Quarterly Review, July, 1869, pp. 463, 464.

iness and authority of some of the principal books of the New Testament is the recently discovered work, "Refutation of all Heresies," of Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus Romanus, in the first part of the third century. This work was brought by a Greek, Mynoides Mynos, from Mount Athos to Paris in 1842, and published at Oxford in 1851. Its value is recognized by the greatest scholars. Gieseler describes it as "indisputably the most important discovery of recent times for the history of philosophy and of the ancient Church." Even the extreme Rationalists of the Tübingen school generally admit its credibility; and Baur, their head, in the last edition of his Church History, makes great use of it, and expressly defends its truthfulness against the Roman Catholic scholars, who would gladly reject as untrue what Hippolytus relates to the disadvantage of some of the bishops at Rome.

BASILIDES.

Respecting this great heretic, De Groot remarks:

We wish, first of all, to make our readers more intimately acquainted with this man a contemporary of the last surviving apostle, and his testimony to the antiquity and authority of several writings of the New Testament, especially of the Gospels of Luke and John, that we may afterward compare what we shall find in him with other testimonies of the most ancient times.

But the question arises, When did Basilides live? The answer to this question was hitherto quite indefinite, the year 125 being generally assumed as his most flourishing period. But some weeks ago my attention was excited by a passage of Hippolytus, which contains a more exact indication on this point, and which has hitherto been observed by no one; much less has it been brought into connection with other reports. The passage in Hippolytus runs as follows: "Basilides and Isidorus, the genuine son and disciple of Basilides, says that Matthias (who took the apostleship of Judas) imparted to them orally secret doctrines which he had privately heard from the Saviour."

The editors have changed the singular "says" into the plural "say." In Greek these two forms are distinguished by a single letter only, (*φησίν*, *φασίν*,) and the Greek manuscript of Hippolytus has many errors. If "say" must be read, then Hippolytus relates that Basilides and Isidorus both so speak, from which it would follow, if we adhere to the very words, that Matthias had instructed father and son, and that the son must have been old enough to be able himself to hear the Apostle. But if we do not take the passage so literally, and especially if we read the singular, "says," then Hippolytus relates that Basilides says, in which Isidorus agrees with him, that Matthias had made these communications to Basi-

lides, and that Basilides afterward communicated them to Isidorus, and thus, in a certain sense, Matthias had made communications to both. At all events Basilides, at least, was a contemporary of Matthias.

This determination of the time of his life is in harmony with the account given by Clement of Alexandria, that Basilides called himself the disciple of a certain Glaukias, who was said to be a disciple of Peter. Basilides, as we may infer from this, was too young to be able to call himself a disciple of Peter, who was known to have died under Nero in the year 67. He was old enough, however, to come in contact, as Hippolytus relates, with the successor of Judas, Matthias, of whose death there was no definite report in circulation in the Church, and who may, accordingly, have lived till eighty or ninety years after the birth of Christ.

Basilides could accordingly maintain—without uttering any absurdity—that Matthias had communicated to him *orally* secret doctrines of Jesus Christ. This word *orally* evidently lies in the meaning of the Greek (*ἐλογκῆναι*) and in the very nature of the case; for if Matthias had made his communications in writing, Basilides would have quoted his writing by name. Basilides must, therefore, have been too young to have had intercourse with Peter himself, but old enough to enjoy the instructions of Glaukias, a disciple of Peter, and those of one of the last surviving apostles, Matthias perhaps. For, in order to recommend himself to the Christian community, he represented himself as a disciple of Matthias, and could not have fallen into the absurdity of appealing to an apostle to whose probable period of life his own age did not extend.

The time of Basilides can be derived from many other accounts respecting him, all of which place his most flourishing period under Trajan (97–117) and under Hadrian (117–138;) while it is further known with certainty that already under Hadrian a refutation of the principal work of Basilides was made and published by Agrippa Castor. From this it follows that Basilides did not publish his work later than under Hadrian, and, indeed, if not before Hadrian, at least so early under this Emperor that it had already circulated and obtained influence, and another writer had time to write a refutation of it. Besides, the learned writer Jerome states that Basilides died during the persecution of the Christians by Bar-Cochba, (132–135.) At all events he was no longer young, as he did not die later than in the year 135, for he had lived long enough not only to have a son, Isidorus, but to have him as a genuine disciple. If he was in the year 135, the time of his death, sixty years old, he must have been born in the year 75; if seventy years old, then he must have been born in the year 65. In the first case *he had lived about twenty-five years*, in the second case *about thirty-five years, with the Apostle John*, and might have lived some years with other apostles, also with Matthias. We are, accordingly, clearly justified in maintaining that Basilides was a contemporary of the last surviving apostle, (John,) as Jerome has also

clearly asserted, so that his public appearance falls in the time of Trajan, (97-117.)*

Dr. De Groot having thus accurately fixed the age of Basilides, proceeds to consider

THE USE OF THE WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BY
BASILIDES.

It being established, then, that Basilides lived from about 65 until 135, and that he was a younger contemporary of the Apostle John and of other last surviving apostles, we proceed further to consider *what testimonies this man gives to writings of the apostolic age.* Basilides, in the few fragments that are preserved of him in Hippolytus, gives us in rapid succession quotations out of the New as well as out of the Old Testament. He appeals to Gen. i, 3, as to an expression of Moses, "Let there be light, and there was light;" and then he says further, "This is what is written in the Gospels, [John i. 9,] 'That was the true light which enlighteneth all men who come into this world.'" After quoting from Psa. cxxxiii, he introduces the following from Rom. viii, 19, 22: "As it is written, 'The creature itself likewise groans and is in travail, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.'" Somewhat further on we find out of Rom. v, 13, 14, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, as it is written." Following these are various passages of the Old Testament. After citing Proverbs i, 7, he remarks, "This is the wisdom that speaks in a mystery, of which the Scripture says, 'Not with words which human wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth,'" [1 Cor. ii, 13.] Somewhat further on we find the two following passages out of Ephes. iii, 5, 3, and 2 Cor. xii, 4, with an allusion to 1 Cor. xv, 8: "As of an untimely birth has the mystery been made manifest, which was not made known to former centuries, as it is written, 'Through revelation was the mystery made known to me,' and 'I heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter.'" Shortly after follows, "This is that which is said, [Luke i, 35:] 'The Holy Ghost will come upon thee, and the power of the Highest will overshadow thee.'" And finally we read, somewhat further on, "The Saviour says, [John ii, 4,] 'My hour is not yet come.'"

All this clearly proves, in the first place, that Basilides was acquainted with more than one, and at least with two old Gospels, those of John and Luke, as well as with four Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians,

* Baur, in his History of the Church, Th. I, sec. 126, remarks: "The most reliable testimonies respecting the origin of Gnosticism agree that the founders of the Gnostic heresies appeared in the age of Trajan and Hadrian." He names Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion.

and the one to the Ephesians. If, now, the proofs of his acquaintance with these six writings are clear, we are not to conclude that still more books of the New Testament were not known to him, because we do not find them quoted in the few fragments.

But, in the second place, he regarded these writings as Holy Scriptures, clothed with undoubted authority as well as those of the Old Testament. He continually makes use of the standing formulæ, "As it is written," "As the Scripture says," "This is what is said," entirely in the same way in his quotations out of the New as out of the Old Testament. In the midst of quotations from Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms and the Proverbs, appear passages out of the New Testament. He evidently places the books of the New Testament in the same, class with those of the Old.

Further, these biblical books have with Basilides exclusively a sacred authority; for he quotes, so far as we know, no apocryphal writing, no single work of a Greek philosopher. He wishes to recommend his system by means of books which have authority with his readers, and these books are exclusively those of the Bible, both those of the New and of the Old Testament.

Finally, it would have been an absurdity if Basilides had wished to recommend his system by means of these books, if they had not already possessed authority in his time. Basilides is, therefore, not a witness of his own opinion merely, because his object was to procure for his system universal admission among the Christians, and with this aim he recommended it by appealing to the writings of the New Testament. So that it appears altogether certain that already in his time, in the universal judgment of the Church, these writings possessed sacred authority.

These are some of the results which we have obtained from Basilides's own words, preserved only in Hippolytus. But do these results become uncertain and doubtful, or incredible, indeed, when compared with what we know from other quarters respecting Basilides? We shall see.

According to Eusebius and Jerome, Agrippa Castor, in the time of Hadrian, wrote a refutation of the system of Basilides, which was probably directed against the twenty-four books of the latter "On the Gospel." This account of Eusebius and

Jerome is confirmed by other testimonies; for Clement of Alexandria quotes several expressions out of the twenty-third of these books, which Clement calls "Expositions." In these quoted passages we find thoughts and expressions which are evidently borrowed from 1 Peter iv, 14-16. For the existence of these books of Basilides still another witness speaks—some lines in an old writer quoted out of his thirteenth book. Basilides, therefore, most certainly not only made use of several books of our New Testament, but he even published "Expositions of the Gospels" in a comprehensive work which was divided into twenty-four books or chapters.

From this we may infer that Basilides endeavored to recommend his system by artificial explanations of the Old Testament and apostolical writings, especially of the Gospels, (at least those of Luke and John, perhaps also those of Matthew and Mark,) comprehended under the expression, *THE GOSPEL*; for the fragments of him preserved in Hippolytus are full of such explanations, and we find similar explanations also in the passages from his writings and those of his son, Isidorus, and other followers, quoted by Clement of Alexandria Origen, and Epiphanius. Further, it must not be overlooked that in these passages out of Basilides and his followers, besides passages from the Old Testament, there are also quoted Matt. vii, 6; xix, 11, 12; Rom. vii, 7; ix, 10; 1 Cor. vii, 9; 1 Pet. iv, 14-16; so that, in addition to the six writings of the New Testament which we knew, from Hippolytus, were quoted by Basilides, two new books are to be added, Matthew and 1 Peter, the first of which is used by Isidorus, and the second by Basilides himself. Now when Origen and Jerome speak of a Gospel of Basilides altogether unknown to us, Gieseler has already conjectured that by this expression not a special book, but his system was meant. He says: "Basilides wrote twenty-four Books of Expositions which were also probably called his Gospel." The Gospel of Basilides, accordingly, would indicate the same thing as the Gospel of Paul, that is, the preaching or doctrine of Basilides or Paul, but no book of theirs. At all events, the Expositions of Basilides were of *the* Gospel, not of *a* Gospel of Basilides.

This conjecture of Gieseler is strongly confirmed by the particulars which Hippolytus gives us respecting Basilides. According to his statements Basilides distinguishes *the Gospel*, or the glad tidings of the most excellent revelation, from the different books in which the glad tidings are contained.

After Dr. De Groot gives proof of this from Hippolytus he proceeds:

The case is clear, Basilides wrote twenty-four Books of "Expositions of the Gospel," that is, of the science of heavenly things;

This science he obtained, according to his assertion, from the instructions of Matthias and Glaukias, and brought it into harmony with the Gospels of John and Luke, probably also with that of Matthew and the Apostolical Epistles, by arbitrarily explaining these writings to accomplish the harmony. The statement of the other Church Fathers respecting the use that Basilides made of the New Testament agrees entirely with what we find in Hippolytus. Basilides, then, was acquainted with at least two Gospels, those of John and Luke, and his genuine son and disciple, Isidorus, with still another, that of Matthew; and Basilides made use of at least four Epistles of Paul and one of Peter.

But we find still more respecting Basilides. Jerome relates that Marcion and Basilides removed from the New Testament several passages, and even whole Epistles, and that they denied as Paul's especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, that to Titus, and the two to Timothy, while they had no ground for this conduct except the fact that their errors were refuted in these passages, and books. But the Epistles which he denied to be Paul's were then just as well known to Basilides as were the other Epistles which he quotes, and they were acknowledged by his contemporaries to belong to this apostle, otherwise Jerome could not speak of his denying the Pauline origin of these Epistles.

We are accordingly justified from the foregoing in drawing the conclusion that Basilides, the contemporary of the last surviving apostle, was already acquainted with a good part of our New Testament, that he regarded many of its books equally with those of the Old Testament as sacred writings, and that he endeavored to recommend his system by making in a comprehensive exegetical work, expositions of the Gospel.

But we must further conclude, as I have already indicated, that the public opinion of the Christians in the time of Basilides had already placed the books of the New Testament as high as he himself did, because, to recommend his system, he appealed against them to these books, explained in his own way, as sacred writings.*

USE OF THE WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AMONG THE OTHER, OLDEST GNOSTICS.

From Basilides we now turn to the oldest sect of the Gnostics themselves, to the Naasseans or Ophites, that is, Serpent-Brethren. We shall see that these, so far as it concerns their knowledge of

* Professor Scholten, in his work "The Oldest Witnesses," etc., says, "Basilides, according to the testimony of the Fathers, had made a Gospel of his own, to which he gave his own name, and he asserted that he was indebted for his wisdom not to the writings of the New Testament, but to a secret tradition reaching back to the apostles, and especially to Peter, communicated to him by means of a certain Glaukias." "I must call special attention to the fact," says De Groot, "that what is here said of Basilides on the ground of patristic testimony is not said by the Fathers at all, but is a pure inference of Mr. Scholten. Scholten reads in the

the New Testament and their appreciation of it, perfectly agree with Basilides. These Serpent-Brethren, some of whom found true wisdom in the serpent, (Gen. iii,) from which the name of the sect arose, have become better known to us than formerly from the numerous fragments of their writings preserved in Hippolytus.

They were evidently the oldest sect of the Gnostics. Hippolytus says, when he begins to speak of the Gnostics: "The first priests and forerunners of this doctrine are the Ophites; afterward they gave themselves the name of Gnostics, (enlightened ones,) while they maintain that to them alone the depths of wisdom are known. From these have many heretical sects broken off, who have taught the same thing in a different way." Irenæus, who was likewise acquainted with them, says in the conclusion of his account of them that "the school of Valentinus sprang out of them." They are, therefore, older than Valentinus, respecting whose age we shall speak presently. That they are older than Valentinus and are his teachers appears from their system, which is more simple than his, but follows the same direction. This system is with them a germ in a state of development, but with Valentinus it has attained a further growth. They themselves related that they were indebted for their deep mysterious doctrine to a certain Marianne, (otherwise entirely unknown,) to whom James, the brother of Jesus, had intrusted it. But James died as a martyr before the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year 69, as was generally known, consequently they do not date their origin earlier than the year 70; at latest, still in the first or beginning of the second century. They must, therefore, have arisen about the same time that Basilides did. Their latest writing known to us is a hymn sung at their secret solemnities, in which their principal ideas are summed up, and which is referred by a great linguist (Schneidewin) to the time of Antoninus Pius, (138-161,) accordingly to the middle of the second century.*

In order to determine with still greater certainty the time in which we find the Ophites, I wish to make some statements respecting the age of Valentinus, who made his appearance after

Fathers that Basilides appeals to Glaukias; from this he *infers* that Basilides did not, therefore, appeal to the writings of the New Testament as a source, and he thus gives us his *inference* as a patristic *testimony*. The words of Scholten 'not to the writings of the New Testament, but' must be stricken out, and with these words fall away all the conclusions he drew from his first inference, which he calls a patristic testimony."

* Scholten says of the Ophites and Perates: "These sects do not yet appear in the writing, *Adversus omnes hæreses*, which forms an appendix to the *Præscriptiones Hæreticorum* of Tertullian, from which it is to be inferred that they cannot belong, as Tischendorf supposes, to the first period of the Gnostics. Alas for the arguments" *e silentio*! But here there is no such silence in Tertullian. Scholten's assertion is—*untrue*. In that appendix, cap. 47, is the following: *Accesserunt hic hæretici etiam illi, qui Ophite nuncupantur*. The Perates were a subordinate division of these.

them. He himself ascribes to himself a high antiquity when he asserts that he was indebted for his secret doctrine to a Theodades, (otherwise unknown,) who was a disciple of Paul. Further, we know, what does not contradict this, that after he had in the time of Hadrian (117-138) spread his doctrine in Egypt, he came from Alexandria to Rome as a party-leader about the year 140, and died, an old man, in Cyprus about the year 160. As this Valentinus is younger than the first Ophites, their sect must reach back into the first century.* They are generally recognized as the oldest sect of the Gnostics. Some, indeed, maintain that Paul (1 Tim. i, 4) refers to them, which is not impossible, because Phrygia, their native place, was not far from the Church in Ephesus, of which Timothy was overseer.

How, then, did this sect—that appeared before Valentinus with writings that contained the germ of the Valentinian system—stand toward the New Testament? What did they know of it, and what value did they attach to it? They proceed in the same way as Basilides. They quote in rapid succession on one page many passages out of the New Testament, place them on a par with those from the Old Testament, make use of them, explained in their way, as proofs of their system, and use the biblical writings as having a sacred authority. They occasionally quote, with the express mention that it is the Scripture which they are using, the following books: Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms, Matthew, Luke, the Gospel of John, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Galatians. Among all the quotations there is found but one apocryphal writing, the *Gospel of Thomas*, quoted, while Hippolytus once compares their views with a passage in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, certainly a striking proof that the Apocrypha, however old some of them may be, not only are later than the Canonical Scriptures, but also that they originally were but little esteemed and but little used. Some passages are quoted in the very words, while others are given more freely; various expressions are cited from the Gospels as the words of the Saviour. The authors, according to the custom of the time, are nowhere named, except in a quotation from 2 Cor. xii, 2-4, Paul, the Apostle, is named where the case required it.

After this we have a sect kindred with the Ophites—before the discovery of Hippolytus's works hardly known to us by name—the Perates, who honored the serpent. They, too, used the books of the Old and New Testaments as authorities to support their doctrines. From the New Testament they quote the Gospel of John, Matthew, Corinthians, and Colossians. These sects quote the Scriptures with the formulæ, "It is said," "The Scripture says," "It is written."

* C. F. Baur says that Valentinus lived a short time after the beginning of the second century in Alexandria, and later in Rome.

THE USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BY VALENTINUS AND HIS PARTY.

Gieseler and many others regard it as remarkable "that Valentinus not only received the New Testament, but that in his system he made a continual allegorical use of it, so that he formed his system of *Æons*, for the most part, after John i. See Irenæus, Lib. I, cap. viii, 5." Valentinus maintained that he had received his doctrine from Theodades, a disciple of Paul. This determination of time is confirmed by the ancients, who relate that he came to Rome about 140, and died, an old man, about the year 160.

The system of Valentinus we already knew quite fully from Irenæus, but now still better from Hippolytus. From both, and from other Church Fathers, we know that Valentinus and his followers possessed the writings of the New Testament as well as those of the Old, and used them as invested with sacred authority. Irenæus says this of them in the clearest language. He cites a number of passages from the Bible which Valentinus and his party used to give a Christian coloring to their speculations. He quotes incidents and expressions out of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, (i, 1-14,) Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians. The question now arises, What can we with certainty ascribe to Valentinus himself? What did Valentinus, who appeared as the leader of a sect in the time of Hadrian, (117-138,) believe or say of the books of the New Testament?

What Irenæus says of the Gnostics, accordingly of the Valentinians, that they, with the exception of the Marcionites, received the New Testament the same Tertullian says of Valentinus. In contrast with Marcion, who made havoc of the New Testament, he places Valentinus as one who made use of the New Testament without any alteration. Also Irenæus says, where he speaks of the credibility of Luke, that Marcion as well as Valentinus cites much that is to be found only in Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles. Further, the doctrine of the *Æons*, the foundation of the whole Valentinian system, which must have proceeded from him, and which is conceded by every body to be his doctrine, was brought by him entirely into connection with John i, 1-14, and, as it appears, was derived from a work called by him and his sect "The Book of John, the disciple of the Lord."*

The result that we have obtained, that Valentinus himself was acquainted with a large portion of the New Testament as we have possessed it since the time of Tertullian and Irenæus, and that he made use of it along with the old Testament, is confirmed by Hip-

*Irenæus, Lib. I, cap. viii, 5. Strauss, who endeavors to break the force of this passage says, "Life of Jesus," 1864, p. 68, that this paragraph is taken from Ptolemæus, therefore it cannot relate to Valentinus himself. But he can have no other ground for this than that in the old translation of Irenæus, at the end, are found these words: *Et Ptolemæus quidem ita*. But this is a gloss of the translator. It is not found in the Greek text of Irenæus!

polytus, who gives us extracts, partly from Valentinus himself, and partly from the writings of his school in general.

Hippolytus cites, as taken from Valentinus himself, the following books of the New Testament: The Gospel of John, Luke, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians.

But when Hippolytus has quoted a passage of Luke on the conception of Jesus (Luke iv, 35) out of Valentinus, he remarks, "A difference of opinion has sprung up on this point among the disciples of Valentinus, so that they have divided into an Oriental and an Italian school." And then Hippolytus further speaks of these disciples, partly of all of them in general, and partly of individuals, with the special addition of their name. It is clear, then, that Valentinus, who appeared in the time of Hadrian as the head of a sect, himself was acquainted with and used as Holy Scripture the New Testament, and, along with it, the fourth Gospel as a writing of "John, the disciple of the Lord."

From Valentinus De Groot passes on to the most distinguished of the earliest disciples of Valentinus—Ptolemæus and Heracleon.

Of Ptolemæus we still possess one epistle, in which a multitude of passages are quoted from the Old Testament and from Matthew, one out of John, and several from the Epistles of Paul. In the quotation of John i, 3, he remarks, "The apostle therefore says." We possess far more from Heracleon, who was not only a scholar, but also an acquaintance, and therefore a contemporary, probably somewhat younger, of Valentinus. Besides other works, he wrote an exposition of the Gospel of John, of which Origen has preserved for us numerous fragments. From these fragments it appears that Heracleon explained this Gospel allegorically and arbitrarily, but that he in no way doubted its credibility, or its Johannean origin. Heracleon not only raises no objection to the apostolical origin of the fourth Gospel, but even remarks on John i, 16, (in Origen :) "The disciple (John) does not say this, but the Baptist (John.)" With this falls to the ground the remark of Scholten, that Heracleon has nowhere said that he regarded John as the author of the Gospel. That Heracleon should write an exposition of the Gospel of John to recommend his own views is a sufficient proof that as a general thing in his time, about the middle of the second century, this Gospel had absolute authority in the whole Church, among the Catholics as well as among the Gnostics. As far as Valentinians are concerned, this is not only expressly affirmed by Irenæus, but their very words are quoted: "John, the disciple of the Lord, writes when he speaks of the origin of all things: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.'" Then the first fourteen verses of the Gospel are cited almost

entire, and explained in their own way. But the Valentinians are Valentinus, Ptolemæus, and Heracleon. Therefore Heracleon ascribed the fourth Gospel to John, the disciple of the Lord. Further, it is evident from the words of Heracleon that he was also acquainted with Matthew and Luke, perhaps also Mark, and with at least several of the Epistles of Paul.* It must also be borne in mind that we find in Irenæus a great multitude of passages from the New Testament which Valentinus and his disciples quote; so it is evident, not from Hippolytus only, that they made an extensive use of the New Testament.

I can adduce still another strong proof, hitherto scarcely noticed, that the oldest Gnostics made use of the New Testament exactly in the manner represented by Hippolytus in his numerous citations from their writings.

In the works of Clément of Alexandria is found an extract from the writings of a Valentinian of the name of Theodotus, and of some of similar sentiments, which is exuberant—entirely after the manner of the Gnostics in Hippolytus—in quotations and allegorical explanations of passages from the Bible, and especially from the New Testament, while not a single quotation of an apocryphal Gospel appears in it. The only question is, When did this Theodotus and his kindred spirits live? This question seems hitherto to have been overlooked. It is, however, expressly given in the title itself, which runs as follows: "Extracts from the writings of Theodotus, and of the so-called Oriental doctrine of the time of Valentinus." We shall see whether this date deserves credit.

Thus the very words are here professed to be given us of the Valentinians who lived in the time of their master. But Valentinus had already finished his system before the year 138; in the year 140 he appeared in Rome, and died in 160. In these extracts, then, the Valentinians speak from the middle of the second century. We must assume this if internal evidence does not contradict the title in this respect, and in my judgment this is not the case; for I find nothing in them which points to a later, but much which points to the given date; and as these extracts, as far as the use of the Bible is concerned, entirely agree with those of Hippolytus, they thereby mutually confirm their credibility.

The extracts from Theodotus and the Oriental doctrine fill, in an edition of the works of Clement in small octavo, only thirty pages, and, nevertheless, they contain eleven literal or substantial quotations from the Old, and not less than seventy-

* De Groot shows that Scholten is entirely wrong in supposing that Irenæus does not mention Heracleon.

eight from the New Testament.* Besides, these passages are cited exactly from the same writings, and explained in a similar way as Valentinus and his school do in Irenæus and Hippolytus. Can one, indeed, wish a stronger confirmation of the credibility of the quotations of Hippolytus than these citations out of Theodotus and other old Valentinians?

RESULTS.

Basilides, a younger contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, does not then stand alone in his use of many books of the New Testament. With him agree several of his younger and older contemporaries, the earliest sects, and the founders of sects among the Gnostics. In the same way as Basilides, the Ophites, (with the exception of the Perates and Sethians, who are probably later,) Valentinus, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Theodotus, and their followers, make use of the New and the Old Testament as holy writings, or writings possessing authority. And although we may not be able to determine exactly from the sparsely scattered fragments of their works whether they possessed and recognized all the books of the New Testament, as they were known to Irenæus and his successors, yet we know this with certainty of the most important writings, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Peter; while Basilides also, if we can trust the testimony of Jerome, denied as Paul's the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and to the Hebrews, so that they must have been known to him and recognized by others as Paul's.

It must be observed, further, that these Gnostics not only placed the books of the Old and the New Testament as holy writings in a rank by themselves, but that they wished that their doctrines should have authority with the Christians from these writings alone. And although they occasionally quote a passage out of Homer and out of other heathen writers, the impression is very different from the quotation of Scripture with

* Dr. De Groot gives a half page of small type notes containing the quoted passages. They are introduced with the formulæ, "The Saviour says," "The word of Jesus," "The apostle says," etc.

the formulæ, "It is written," "It is said," "The Scripture says," "The Saviour says," "The apostle writes." *

It is singular that only a few passages from apocryphal writings are quoted by them. Only a few words from the Gospel of Thomas and that of the Egyptians are found in the midst of numerous citations from the canonical Scriptures. And although they have erred in placing these Gospels (apocryphal) too high, yet this is only an exception among more than one hundred and sixty quotations from our New Testament; and when later writers speak of a *Gospel of Basilides*, and a *Gospel of the Truth* of the Valentinians, there is no sufficient ground for supposing here Basilides and Valentinus's own works, but that their system was thereby meant; at any rate, works in which their followers summed up the system of their predecessors.

Finally, the Gnostics would never have thought of appealing to the Scriptures of the New Testament if these writings had not possessed, in the universal conviction of Christians, a sacred authority. For the Gnostics sought to gain for their peculiar *medley* of heathenism and Christianity admission into the Christian community. To this medley they gave the name of a deeper science, GNOSIS, which, in order to give it a Christian coloring, they pretended to have received, as a secret doctrine of the Lord, out of the mouth of the Apostle Matthias, or of a disciple of the apostles, of Glaukias, for example, or of Marianne or Theodades. In order to give to this pretense the appearance of truth, they took writings universally acknowledged and possessing authority, and explained them in such a way that the same doctrine might seem to be found in them that they pretended to have received from an apostle, or the disciple of an apostle. If, in their time, the Old Testament had been the only writings which the Christians regarded as sacred, they would have had an easy task by means of allegorical explanations, more or less after the manner of Philo, in making the Old Testament say whatever pleased them. But they took upon themselves the very difficult task of lending to their dreams an authority from the Gospels and Apostolical Epistles, as well as from the Law

* Irenæus says, Lib. III, cap. ii, 7: "So great is the certainty respecting these (four) Gospels that even the heretics themselves bear witness to them, and every one of them, setting out from these Gospels, endeavors to establish his doctrine."

and the Prophets. The only possible reason why they undertook this hopeless task was that the Christians would otherwise have repelled them immediately with the exclamation, "We know better than that from the preaching and the writings of the apostles and evangelists." The endless labor, of which the Gnostics never grew weary, of finding a foundation for their system in the Gospels and in the Epistles of Paul and Peter, would have been folly if these writings could have been thrown aside, and it had been necessary to appeal to the writings of the Old Testament only. The use which the Gnostics made of the New Testament requires that, in their time, by far the greatest part at least of this New Testament, along with the Old, possessed authority and was used as Holy Scripture in the Church.

From this frequent and thorough recognition and use of the apostolic writings by these Gnostics, who flourished from 97 or earlier to 150, it clearly follows that about the beginning of the second century the most important books of the New Testament were not only already in existence, but were in general circulation and were every-where recognized in the Church, and, although no mention was yet made of a Canon, regarded as sacred writings possessing authority, and were bound up with those of the Old Testament.*

WHY DID THE GNOSTICS EARLIER THAN THE CATHOLICS
APPEAL TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE WRITINGS OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT ?

Under this head De Groot remarks: "Until a few years ago the opinion prevailed that Theophilus of Antioch, about the year 170, was the first Church Father that placed the writings of the New Testament in the same rank with those of the Old." But since the discovery of the very ancient manuscript of the Bible in the Convent of Mount Sinai by Tischendorf—at the close of which is the Epistle of Barnabas in the original Greek text, containing the following passage of Matthew, pref-

* Here also Baur comes to my aid. He acknowledges the credibility and accuracy of Hippolytus, (*Church History*, I, pp. 181-183, etc.,) and has no doubt of the accuracy of his quotations from Basilides, Valentinus, etc. Consequently, if Baur were consistent, he ought to acknowledge that the Gospels, especially that of John, and many Epistles, were already known to Basilides and to others of the oldest Gnostics.

aced with the remark, *as it is written*, (ὡς γέγραπται), "Many are called, few are chosen"—it is evident that one Church Father, at least, at the beginning of the second century,* the time when this Epistle of Barnabas was written, must have quoted one book of the New Testament as a part of Holy Scripture.

In addition to this epistle of Barnabas we have the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in which is given what each of the twelve sons of Jacob, upon his death-bed, said to his children and grandchildren; among other things, the future of their people and the blessings of Christianity. The author is evidently a well-wishing, thoughtful, earnest man, who sought in this way to gain over the Jews to Christianity. He wrote toward the end of the first or the beginning of the second century; at all events, in the first half of the second century before the third destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian in the year 135.† In this pretended prophecy allusion is made to the Apostle Paul, and it is added: "*In the holy books* will both his deeds and his speeches be described." *The holy books* in which the deeds and speeches of Paul were to be recorded can scarcely be any other than the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. We thus see that these writings are called by the author *holy books*; and it may also be added that not only these, but nearly all the books of our New Testament, to which he frequently alludes, and from which he takes very many words and thoughts, are regarded as sacred.

In the oldest Church Fathers we find more frequently quotations from the Gospels than the Epistles, and Eusebius expressly relates that in the time of Trajan (97–117) men went from Palestine to travel among the heathen as evangelists, "while they wished to preach Christ and to distribute the Scripture of

* It is not necessary to refer this book to the beginning of the second century, as De Groot does. Clement of Alexandria, President of its catechetical school, (191–202,) attributes the Epistle to Barnabas, which he could not have done had it not come down from the first century. It seems to us most likely to have been written between A. D. 70 and 80. The author refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in such a way as to make the impression that this event had just occurred. See sec. 16. Even Hilgenfeld, the leader of the extreme Rationalistic school of Tübingen, refers the epistle to the first century. We have also the following: "Since you have seen so great signs and wonders among the people of the Jews," sec. 4.

† For this date see in Dorner, *Entwickelung Geschichte von der Lehre der Person Christi*.

the divine Gospels." Under this expression is to be understood our four canonical Gospels. This wide circulation of our Gospels is further confirmed by testimonies and quotations from them in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers.*

The epistle to Diognetus, by its freshness and originality, and by its contrasting Christianity on one hand with Judaism and heathenism on the other, without containing a trace of Gnosticism, makes the impression that it was written at a very early period, before Gnosticism had spread, so that we may, in all probability, refer it to the time of Trajan, in the beginning of the second century. Although this epistle is only a few pages long, it contains allusions from which it follows that its author was acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew and John, the Epistle to the Romans, the second to the Corinthians, that to the Philippians, the first to Timothy, the first Epistle of Peter and the first of John. This epistle to Diognetus would prove still more if we could regard as genuine the last two chapters; for in these two chapters the author calls himself a disciple of the Apostles, and he places the Gospels and the epistles precisely in the same rank with the Law and the Prophets, that is, the New Testament with the Old. He writes, (in the Christian community) "The fear of the law is sung, the grace of the prophets is made known, the faith of the Gospels is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept." He quotes 1 Cor. viii, 1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth," with the addition, "as saith the apostle." There are, however, weighty reasons against the genuineness of these last two chapters.

Justin Martyr may also be cited as a witness to the early authority of the Gospels. He says in his larger Apology, written probably about 147,† that in the assemblies of the Chris-

* De Groot does not enter into the proof of the use of our Gospels by the Apostolic Fathers. The ground he assigns for this is, "Because, at present, the genuineness, at least the integrity, of all these writings is disputed." There is no reason whatever for questioning the genuineness or the substantial integrity of the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written A. D. 95-98. This epistle was usually read in the Christian assemblies in Corinth in the second century. See Eusebius, IV, 23, 6. Nor is the epistle of Polycarp to be doubted either in respect to its genuineness or integrity. It is referred to by Irenæus, Eusebius, IV, 14, 3.

† We prefer with Neander, Gieseler, Tischendorf, and others, on what we think very good grounds, to refer this work to the year 138 or 139.

tians the memoirs of the apostles or the writing of the prophets are read. He also remarks a few lines before that these memoirs are called GOSPELS; and finally, that they were written by the apostles and their companions. The Gospels of the apostles and their companions and the writings of the prophets were thus, already in his time, placed so completely on a par that they made use of the one as well as of the other in divine service. That he by apostles means Matthew and John, and by their companions, Mark and Luke, may be justly inferred from many quotations and allusions in his work, although he may have known a fifth Gospel besides, and ascribed it to an apostle.* It is also evident from his works that he probably was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles and with many epistles, and that he was certainly acquainted with the Apocalypse.

As an example of the method the heretics pursued in using the Gospels in support of their system De Groot gives the following: Basilides placed at the head of his system an absolute Nonentity, in order that he might not be able to speak of God as of an existing, but as of a non-existing Being. Originally, therefore, there was nothing, no matter, no substance, nothing that had substance, nothing simple, nothing compound, no man, no angel, no God; accordingly nothing of all that which we can perceive or imagine. Nevertheless the non-existing God created a non-existing world out of non-entity. After Basilides has made this assertion he gives a Christian varnish to his representation. He continues: "This is what Moses says: Let there be light, and there was light. Out of what was light made? Out of nothing. For it is not written out of what; it came into existence simply from the voice of the speaker; but the speaker had no existence at all, and that which was created was likewise non-existent. Out of nonentity sprang the seed of the world, namely, the word which was spoken: Let there be light. And this is that which is said in the Gospels: That was the true light that lighteth all men who come into the world."

How, asks De Groot, were the allegorical, fanciful and

* We find in the writings of Justin no proof of his use of a fifth Gospel, to which De Groot here alludes, nor do we think that Tischendorf has made out this point in his work, "When were our Gospels written?"

absurd expositions of the Gnostics to be refuted ? Not by appealing to the written word, for to this word the heretics themselves appealed, but by appealing to the authority of the *Living Word*, as it had been preached by the apostles and was still preached by their disciples. In proof of the great stress that the Christians of the second century laid upon this *living* traditional word, he quotes Papias and Irenæus. He likewise refers to Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian of Carthage, whose lives extended into the third century, as attaching great importance to the traditions of the Church.

De Groot likewise calls attention to the fact that under the prosperous reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius, there still lived eye-witnesses of the time of Christ and his Apostles, and that communication with different parts of the Christian world was easy, so that there was no difficulty in obtaining the history of Christ from oral testimony, which rendered unnecessary the appeal to the written word ; while the Gnostics, whose doctrines were entirely at variance with the living traditions of the Church, had no resource for establishing their system but in elaborate, forced and fanciful expositions of the Gospels.

DO THE CITATIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT REALLY PROCEED FROM THE OLDEST GNOSTICS ?

The principal objection which the Tübingen school raises against the assertion that Basilides quotes the Gospel of John * as one of the Gospels, (for this assertion has already been very often made by scholars,) and against the quotations from the New Testament in the oldest Gnostics, is this, that we do not know with certainty whether all that Hippolytus attributes to the old Gnostics really proceeds from these, and not from some who lived later. Especially is this the case respecting Basilides. What Hippolytus quotes from him is not from Basilides himself, they say, since it may possibly proceed from some one who indeed belonged to the school of Basilides, but may have lived later.† For, they say, Hippolytus makes no clear dis-

* Hippolytus, III, 22. This is what is written in the Gospels, That was the true light which lightens all men who come into this world.

† This objection of the Tübingen school, scarcely deserves a refutation. We know from the best testimony that Basilides *wrote* twenty-four books in explanation of his system. De Groot has clearly shown that. The followers of Basilides must have

tion between the head of a sect and the members of a sect, as we see, for example, when he speaks of Valentinus and his school. This remark, so far as it concerns Valentinus and his school, is not without ground. Neither Hippolytus, nor Tertullian, nor Irenæus always clearly distinguish the founder from the disciples in this school. Where they speak of them they generally say, "Valentinus and his followers," or "the school of Valentinus," or the "Valentinians." This was altogether proper; for Valentinus did not there stand alone, but had a number of independent men for disciples and friends who improved his system and made changes in it. Tertullian clearly expresses this when he says, "Valentinus opened the way, Ptolemæus paved it, and Heracleon furnished it with by-roads." Thus, although we know in many respects what must be attributed to Valentinus, namely, the opening of the way or the foundation of the system, yet it is not possible every-where to distinguish the master from his disciples. But with Basilides the matter is entirely different. Here we have not a master, and disciples independently making changes in his system, but only a master whose system was adopted and implicitly followed, but not improved. Valentinus stood at the head and in the midst of numerous independent followers, while Basilides stood alone at the head of individuals who followed his views without making any changes in them. The only one of his followers that we are acquainted with is Isidorus, and he is "his genuine son and disciple." When, therefore, Irenæus speaks of the system of Basilides he does not say, as of Valentinus, "Basilides and his followers," or "the school of Basilides," or "the Basilidians," but with the greatest brevity, "Basilides." Hippolytus does the same. When he speaks of the system of this man he gives us sometimes to understand that many followed him, and he very often speaks of them (the Basilidians) in the plural, but every time he expressly repeats that he speaks of the system of Basilides. This is so

preserved this work of their founder to the time of Hippolytus at least, a hundred years. That Hippolytus should leave the work of the founder of the system and refute some obscure follower of his, and call it refuting Basilides, is altogether absurd. He had no distinguished follower with whom he could be confounded. Who, in attempting a refutation of Calvin, would think of quoting and refuting some obscure follower of his, with the pretense that he was quoting and refuting Calvin himself? The quoting of John by Basilides is in justification of the very foundation of his system.

much the more remarkable as Hippolytus, when he speaks of both of them at the same time, himself says that he is treating of the system of THE SCHOOL OF VALENTINUS and of the system of BASILIDES. In his copious exposition he closes Book VI with the remark that he is now going to pass from the SCHOOL OF VALENTINUS to BASILIDES. And in the summary at the end of his work he speaks, X, 13, of the SCHOOL OF VALENTINUS, and afterward, § 14, of BASILIDES. Thus we have almost continually "Valentinus and his party," and on the other hand only "Basilides."

This great difference F. C. Bauer himself recognizes when he says it cannot certainly be shown what belongs to Valentinus and what to his followers, because Hippolytus does not speak of the system of Valentinus, but of the VALENTINIAN SYSTEM; but when he comes to Basilides, he (Hippolytus) explains THE SYSTEM OF BASILIDES and not the Basilidian system. Accordingly the effort, from the uncertainty that exists in reference to Valentinus, to infer a similar uncertainty respecting Basilides is nothing but a sheer subterfuge. The words of Basilides quoted in Hippolytus are really the words of Basilides, and not those merely in which he quotes two passages of John, but all the others in which he quotes something from the Old and the New Testament.

Yet, upon the whole, the doubt may be raised, Must what Hippolytus gives us as taken from the old Gnostics really belong to them and not to later Gnostics? The Tübingen school asserts the latter, because their system respecting the later origin of the writings of the New Testament irrevocably falls if Hippolytus faithfully quotes.

We have several reasons against this doubt.

The most of the quotations of the Gnostics out of the New as well as out of the Old Testament are found in Hippolytus, who made it his duty to give the passages which they used, and the way in which they did it. But he is not the only one who gives us such quotations. Irenæus has preserved for us many, and Clement also single ones, and the author of the extracts from Theodotus, in the works of Clement, very many quotations.

We must further remark that Hippolytus, who lived near Rome, or in that city itself, where all the heretics, or many

of their disciples, at least, resorted, possessed sources for obtaining the original ideas of the Gnostics which were unknown to Irenæus in Lyons, or even to Clement in Alexandria.

Although Hippolytus may fail in giving us accurately the different sources of the Gnostic philosophy or the connection of their ideas, this does not militate against the accuracy of his quotations from their writings.

Irenæus and Hippolytus differ greatly in talent and in the object of their writings. Irenæus is not philosophical, but practical. His object was to show the *unchristian* character of Gnosticism. He has, in accordance with his own statement, set forth the doctrine of the Valentinians as represented in the writings of some of the disciples of Valentinus, especially of Ptolemæus and his party, and also from their conversations. Hippolytus is rather a philosophical intellect, so that he goes back to the founders of the sects in order to show the origin of their different ideas and their connection with the Greek systems.

But in the principal point, all those who give us accounts of the Gnostics agree. Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, and Hippolytus represent them as quoting and arbitrarily explaining in support of their systems passages from the Old and the New Testament. As the Gnostics wished to recommend their systems as Christian, there was no other course left to them.

Had these quotations in Hippolytus, and likewise the extracts from Theodotus and the Oriental school in the works of Clement of Alexandria, been taken from the later Gnostics, among the more than one hundred and sixty passages there would not indeed have been found merely two or three out of an Apocryphal Gospel, and in general also passages from writings which at a later period were added to the Books of the New Testament. We know how Irenæus complains respecting the numerous Apocryphæ which the Gnostics in his time made use of, and how not only Clement of Alexandria considers the Epistle of Barnabas to be Holy Scripture, but also in the Codex Sinaiticus Barnabas and Hermas, and in the Codex Alexandrinus the Epistle of Clement of Rome is added to the New Testament. But in the quotations out of the old Gnostics in Hippolytus we find not a

single one of these books cited. Can any other reason be assigned for this than that they at that time were not in existence, or had not yet come into use, at all events were not esteemed?

De Groot refers to the Syrian Cerdo, one of the very oldest of the Gnostics, as confirming Hippolytus's statement of the way in which Basilides quotes. Cerdo lived in Rome, in the time of Bishop Hyginus, (139-143,) and had for his disciple Marcion. Theodoret cites several words from this Cerdo, in which he makes a distinction between the God of the Jews and the Father of Jesus Christ. The former, says Cerdo, commands in the law to strike out an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but the good God commands in *the Gospels* that we shall offer the left cheek to him who smites us on the right, etc.

RESULTS AND INFERENCES.

Already in the times of the Apostles communications were made by letters, which passed from one society to another. (Acts xv, 23-29; xvi, 4; Col. iv, 16.) There were already widely circulated written accounts of the life of Jesus even before Luke wrote his Gospel. About the end of the first or beginning of the second century the commencement of a collection of writings on the Life of Jesus was already made, known as "Gospels," which were widely spread from Palestine especially, (Eusebius, III, 37,) and of Epistles, at least of Paul and Peter, which Gospels and Epistles were used in the earliest period as containing the only trustworthy accounts and views of the life and works of Jesus.

They immediately began to be placed, as holy writings possessing authority, on a par with the books of the Old Testament. For Basilides, the younger contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, was acquainted with such a collection—to which belonged at least the Gospels of Luke and John, and several Epistles of Paul, with one of Peter—and quoted from these and from the Old Testament exclusively proofs for his system, and wrote twenty-four Books of Expositions of the Gospel. Also Cerdo, a younger contemporary of Basilides, was acquainted with such a collection of GOSPELS, (about the year 135,) which he contrasted with the law of Moses.

This collection of writings of the New Testament arose neither accidentally, nor in consequence of critical investigations, nor through the ordinance of a synod, but it had its origin in the interest felt for every thing that proceeded from the Apostles and their companions. It was adopted upon the testimony of reliable men who had associated with the Apostles. And when many spurious writings made their appearance, this collection was carefully separated from them by the sound judgment of the Christians and carefully preserved. In exercising this judgment they were governed by external and internal evidence.

The possibility of the enlargement of this collection was soon obviated; for only the Apostles, and a very few of their companions, were filled with the Holy Spirit, by means of which they were enabled to write down the words of God. Upon the whole, a chasm so deep and wide separates the writings of the Apostles from those of their companions that the writings of the latter, with the exception of a very few books which we have from them in the New Testament, (for example, the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and the Epistle to the Hebrews,) could be regarded by only a few Christians as sacred writings.

Before the middle of the second century the greatest part of our present New Testament was known to the Gnostics of that period, who quoted passages from it in support of their system. Of this, Basilides, the Ophites, and Valentinus are examples. Valentinus, who set up his system in the time of Hadrian, (117-138,) made use of the Four Gospels and many other Books of the New Testament. Marcion and Cerdo likewise used a part of the New Testament.

In the numerous quotations of the Gnostics from the New Testament there is, with few exceptions, an entire absence of quotations from apocryphal writings. Only the Gospel of Thomas, in the midst of one hundred and sixty-seven passages out of the New Testament, is once cited, and it is mentioned that the doctrine of the Ophites agrees with the Gospel of the Egyptians.

But so far as these apocryphal writings are ancient, they confirm the still greater antiquity of the canonical Scriptures; for the Apocryphæ are, as every body, even the Tübingen school, acknowledges, nothing more than (in the highest degree unsuc-

cessful) imitations and supplements of the canonical Scriptures. And as the Protevangel of James and the Gospel of Thomas arose before the year 150, it follows that our four canonical Gospels before this period were generally acknowledged as such.

That these books already at an early period were known and possessed unique authority among the Catholics is evident from the old Epistle of Barnabas, in which a passage is quoted out of Matthew as a testimony of SCRIPTURE; perhaps also from the EPISTLE of POLYCARP; certainly from the TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS; also from the very old Epistle to Diognetus.

All this can be confirmed by the authority of F. C. Baur, namely, the credibility of Hippolytus, the age of Basilides, Valentinus, and Heracleon; the antiquity of the Ophites; the use of the writings of the New Testament by the oldest Gnostics; their forced allegorical explanation of these Scriptures, and the custom of the Catholics in appealing to the living preaching against the Gnostics.

The quotations of the earliest Gnostics are made from the very same Gospels that we possess. And there is not the slightest indication (quite different from the Apocryphal Gospels, which depart so widely from each other) that in the time of Basilides, a contemporary of the last surviving Apostle, or in that of the Ophites or of Valentinus, our Gospels existed in any other form than that in which we now have them.

The pretended results of the historical criticism of the Tübingens on the late origin of most of the books of the New Testament are hereby once for all refuted. There exists for the antiquity and genuineness of the principal Books of the New Testament such a connected series of old and certain testimonies as can scarcely, if at all, be found for any other writings of the earlier centuries. Most clearly can this be shown of that writing which has been most disputed—the Gospel of John.

In our next article we shall give the substance of De Groot's arguments in proof of the apostolical origin of this Gospel.

ART. II.—THE MUSCOVITE AND THE TEUTON.

THERE is, in the mighty realm of the Czar, a new and aggressive movement on the part of the enthusiastic Russians, who look more to the half-barbaric splendor of the past than to the need of the present or the glory of the future against all nationalities that are not of Slavonic origin; and there is, at the same time, an almost insane effort on the part of these same Russians to incorporate into their national *plexus* every tribe or nationality that can possibly be construed as belonging to the Slavonic family.

Thus modern Russia aspires to the proportions of that fabled giant that needed to stoop to enjoy a view of his own limbs, while at the same time he would undertake the stern task of assimilating to himself all that his long arms can reach, so that we monthly listen to the story of new conquests on the shores of the Caspian or the confines of the Eastern Pacific. But this digestion is by no means always perfect; and the object of this article is to treat of a case which is just now causing Russia considerable uneasiness and discomfort.

The German element has long exerted a controlling influence in civilizing and refining Russia. The army of Peter the Great was largely commanded by German officers, who thus, in the earliest days of Russia's national existence, performed a great part in giving her strength, form, and organization. When the State was fairly formed, it was German publicists and statesmen who molded and developed her internal affairs, and German diplomatists who cultivated and guided her foreign policy and relations. Thus German became the language of her army and her court, and the vehicle for the transfer of foreign culture to her soil. For many years there was scarcely a teacher within her realm who was not a German, and all science and literature that came from without bore the Teutonic garb. The language of her schools was German, as was that of her scientific bodies. Only one short year ago the Academy of Natural Sciences of St. Petersburg resolved hereafter to transact their sessions and publish their proceedings in Russian.

The industrial interests of Russia were fairly built up by

German artisans and mechanics. They manned her factories, ran her workshops, worked her mines, and were the first to develop nearly all her internal resources. Her steam-engines and steamboats were largely constructed and commanded by Germans, and in later years these same men have done a portion of labor in the introduction of railroads and telegraphs, sharing these enterprises with English and American capitalists, machinists, and mechanics. Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that the Germans have exerted a controlling influence in Russia, amassing wealth, and filling the most significant positions in every sphere of the Empire. Large numbers of them have emigrated to Russia to find less crowded fields of enterprise than at home, and have settled permanently throughout the land. Some authorities count them by millions, and others make them less numerous, the numbers given varying according to the interest of the statistician, in the absence of any very definite enumeration.

But after having furnished the leading-strings for the infant nation, and taught him all the true elements of national greatness, the rapidly maturing giant, outgrowing these teachers and becoming jealous of them, is now turning on those who showed him wherein lay his strength: Modern Russia is so rampant that Germany can now scarcely live in the same house with him, and in some parts of the realm there is open and declared war between the German and the Russian elements. It is becoming a part of the creed of advanced Russians to despise every thing that is German, and to imagine that they are already equal to their teachers if not superior to them. These latter, therefore, are to be stamped out or Russianized in matters of language, religion, and nationality. And this ungrateful and unmanly task is now the main endeavor of the Russian party, which is as blind as it is assuming. Russia is far from being able to dispense with German skill and genius, patience and culture, and, in its selfish efforts to do so, it is depriving itself of its most valuable instruments for developing its resources and keeping in the true path of national greatness.

The immediate scenes of these internecine troubles are the Russian provinces of the Baltic known as Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia: these extend along the southern shore of this

sea, from the Prussian frontier to the Gulf of Finland, and approach St. Petersburg. One hundred and fifty years ago the Germans began to creep along these shores and settle in the interior, and their advent was favored by the Russian Government, as were their rights and privileges guaranteed by treaty. They have long been the ruling race in these regions, and their farms, and schools, and workshops have been the nurseries whence the Empire has drawn its young and cultivated forces for new enterprises and development. But they are and desire to remain Russians as to their national obligations, preserving their language and their Lutheran religion. Nearly all classes are Germans except the peasants, and these latter are of course quite numerous, and could become a formidable element in a national collision so near the borders.

Now Russia assails and pretends to fear the German predominance in these provinces, and is resolved to root it out by fair means or foul. The pretense that, in case of national collision, they would side with Prussia, is declared to be totally unfounded, as the mass of the strong arms is found in the Russian peasantry, and their German leaders have all grown up with national ties and interests in Russia. On the other hand it is equally unwise to believe, as is universally affirmed by the Russian press, that Prussia desires to possess these provinces, and is looking toward them with eager eyes. They contain so large a proportion of foreign population that it would be a blind ambition, indeed, that would aspire to possess them. Prussia has a far nobler task before her than that of indulging in foreign conquest—it is that of uniting all the different German nationalities into one strong and invincible Teutonic brotherhood, and in this she can reap far more honor and renown than in any wild foreign conquest.

The days of crossing national frontiers and appropriating a neighbor's territory will, we hope, soon be among the things of the past in Europe, as there is just now scarcely a boundary line that could be infringed upon without bringing about a European contest. Germany desires no extension of its territory, and simply wishes no interference from outsiders, as France and Russia, in internal consolidation. The fear of Russia of being molested in its territorial lines is wholly

groundless, and is, in fact, but little more than a most patent case of judging its neighbor by itself. The Baltic Provinces are a sure possession of the Russian crown, quite as much so as any other of its provinces. If there were to-morrow a coalition between Russia and France to dismember and destroy Germany, these provinces would be found on the side of Russia. There is, therefore, no real sympathy, in a national point of view, between the Germans of these provinces and the Germans of Germany proper. The latter feel for their brothers in these lands as for men that are oppressed in their adopted homes, but extend their sympathy no farther. The real German has no more love for Russia than for France, for he is equally despised and detested in both of these countries, and owes them no love.

Thus the question of Russianizing the Baltic Provinces is in no sense a German one, so far as the German nation is concerned; the latter has but little real interest in the matter. But it is a question of immense import to Russia in the study of its own real and true interests in its national development. Russia is still a barbarous and uncultivated territory, except in and around its few cosmopolitan centers, and it cannot, in reality, afford to cut off those sources of refinement, skill, and culture, that the Germans are sustaining in its own bosom for its own use. And it is this proposition that we desire to develop and enforce in contradistinction to the views of the Russian party, which seems to feel that the German orange has been squeezed, and may now be thrown away.

If German diligence, German stability and learning and loyalty, have been useful to Russia in the past, they have still an ample field for their exercise in the future. It is the wildest folly to endeavor to destroy that healthy leaven that has already made the nation rise. In the one simple department of instruction, public and private, the Russians are almost wholly dependent on the Germans, from the highest walks of literature and science to the lowest grades of elementary instruction. However many good qualities the Russian may possess, he has no aptness for teaching. The few Russians that are successful in this field of labor have, almost without exception, drawn their inspiration from German sources, and are mainly pupils of the German institutions in these Baltic Provinces. Of the

nine Universities scattered throughout Russia, only one has any foreign reputation, and that is almost as wholly German as if it were in Germany: it is that of Dorpat, in one of these provinces. This institution is the great source of supply for teachers of higher grade throughout all Russia; while many of the Russian institutions, properly so called, are very weak in influence and small in numbers. Some find it a difficult task to obtain a competent Faculty to perform the labor of teaching.

Now to crush this University because it is essentially German in its nature were the wildest folly, and yet Young Russia would do this, and establish in its place a normal college in St. Petersburg for the training of teachers in Russian branches. The Germans of Dorpat very sensibly say to the Russians, Let us live with our well-supplied faculties in philology, mathematics, and jurisprudence, and found Government scholarships for the support of students who will bind themselves to study Russian thoroughly and afterward devote themselves for a series of years to teach in Russian schools. This would, certainly, be a far wiser method than for the Russians to vie with each other in destroying a nationality that is able and willing to assist the country in acquiring real strength and worth. In this way a goodly number of efficient scholars and teachers would be obtained, and the country would gain in skillful laborers and useful subjects. If the Russians were wise political economists they would certainly regard these German provinces within their boundaries, and wholly under their control, as sources of culture and profit, and useful centers for the supply of what their growing nation now most needs.

But instead of cultivating this language, with its rich stores of wealth, the Russians are trying to stamp it out of schools and courts, Churches and society, and to introduce in its place a language comparatively uncultivated, and useless for the higher wants of the community. This they will clearly find a much more difficult task than they anticipate, as about the last thing to be eradicated from masses of men is their native tongue. It would be comparatively easy to procure civil officers possessing the language sufficiently well for all purposes of correspondence with the central government, and the children

of the schools would learn the Russian without compulsion if it offered them opportunities of civil or military promotion; and thus a good understanding might be maintained between the two nationalities, that would conduce to their mutual comfort and profit. But the Russian party prefer the crazy policy of Russianizing these provinces, and thus making them bitter enemies of the country in its very midst. The Prussians have and desire to have no voice in the matter; they simply say, "If you and the Russians can stand it we can; and when you get thoroughly disgusted and discouraged with it, gather up your household gods and come back to us and we will receive you."

Germany and Russia are just now on good terms; but will that last for ever? Quite impossible. The Germans fear the Russian desire of conquest about as much as that of the French. The day may not be far distant when these two countries will join hands to oppress Germany. It would not be the first time. If, in the preparation for this coming struggle, Russia can afford to do without the culture and intelligence of the Germans within its border, Germany certainly can; and if Russia, in its hatred of Germany, can forbid its youth to frequent German Universities, at a later period these institutions may refuse to open their doors to Russian students.

A powerful and a willing instrument in this destructive warfare is the Russian press, which is mostly in the hands of these ultra-Russians. For the last ten years its attacks have become more and more violent, until they now scarcely remain within the arena of common justice. It now demands confiscation of property, extinction of ordinary rights, suppression of language, and abolition of the Protestant Church. This is war to the knife! And, unfortunately, the Government yields to these attacks if it does not encourage them; finding it much more easy and congenial to sail with the Russian current than to stem the tide and maintain a parental relation to all its children. Thus it is ever curtailing the privileges of the provinces by filling the important offices with Russians from the interior, while the officials who are suspected of German sympathies are displaced for the slightest cause, or for no cause at all. These Russian intruders soon make themselves at home and assume the bearing of conquerors, because they know they are

supported by the powers around the throne. They force their language on those who would transact business with them, and even make their religion offensive by flaunting it in the face of Protestants and Lutherans.

These measures are carried so far on individual responsibility as to produce a healthy reaction in the public mind, and stir up the lukewarm to activity, and a true sense of the danger of the power that is consolidating itself in their midst. The public spirit of the people has had a rapid growth during the last few years, and is gradually rising to the dignity of an active opposition. Men, like nations, will bend to a mild yoke, though they may feel its burden; they may, indeed, become so gradually accustomed to it as hardly to perceive its weight; but when the oppressor oversteps all bounds they throw off the heavy load and find it a task to submit even to the lighter one of earlier days. Thus the very measures of the enemy are assisting the German leaders in opening the eyes of the people, and making them an active force in the contest. But, in return for this, the Russian Government is trying to get rid of this difficulty by transporting the masses bodily into Russian provinces, and filling their places by genuine Russians to the manor born.

Some thirty years ago a proposition of this kind was started in St. Petersburg, with a view to Russianize the Baltic Provinces at once. The plan was nothing less than an exchange of population between these countries and the plains of Southern Russia, and the peasants were induced to accept it by the promise of free lands in the warm and sunny South. It was soon found that this would cost more than its originators had estimated, and it assumed no great proportions on account of the immense expense attendant on such emigration. But it was not entirely given up, and is still spasmodically pursued in the absence of any thing more effectual. It has of late received a new impetus from the sad fact that for a few seasons past the crops have nearly failed in all these regions, so that famine and consequent disease have made fearful ravages among the people. This has induced them to turn a more willing ear to these propositions of expatriation, and leave their homes in hope of bettering their condition. The most cheerful prospects were held out to them; every thing was to be prepared

for their comfortable reception, and they had nothing to do but go South and take possession of rich and genial lands. Thus allured, hundreds of the Baltic peasants determined to form a pioneer colony; they sold for a song all that they could not take with them, and with good cheer departed for their new home on the banks of the Volga. Here they found barren plains, warm enough in summer, but fearfully cold in winter and destitute of fuel for warmth. They were obliged to build their own houses and make a raw soil fertile in a species of desert far from the conveniences of civilization. The rest of the story is soon told; some enriched the soil with their bodies, others in sorrow and privation sought refuge in neighboring provinces, and a very few again saw their native homes as beggars.

Notwithstanding these sad stories, other colonies have occasionally set out for different regions, with other attractions and promises. These enterprises have generally been undertaken against the advice of all the German influence—teachers, preachers, and local officers—that could be brought to bear upon them, and have generally had the same sad result, as indeed might be expected of an ignorant and inexperienced body of men unacquainted with the language, unprotected by contracts, and uncertain as to the location of the lands to which they seemed led like sheep to the slaughter. The season just passed has seen some of these companies set out with ox and ass, and cart containing the household gods of those desperately intent on seeking an alleviation of their sufferings, and most probably going directly to the sacrificial altar. Artisans and mechanics have been drawn away by thousands toward the interior cities through the most attractive promises of constant labor and generous wages; the Government has taken even more pains to lure these from the Provinces than the peasants, because they are more purely German in speech and character, and, therefore, more dangerous when together in masses than when scattered throughout the realm among the Russian people. Special privileges have been granted to contractors on public works to go with the government shield into these provinces to draw away from them their most skilled mechanics. This is the process of Russianizing the Baltic Provinces, which turns out to be one rather of devastation and

depopulation, as few Russians can be induced by the Government to come and take the places of any but Government officers.

But the sphere in which this conflict becomes most sensitive and delicate, and the one in which it most deeply affects all the provinces, is that of religious belief and observances, for this affects all classes alike, and therefore most closely binds them in a common interest without regard to locality or language. The original and hereditary Church of nearly all the Germans in these provinces is the Lutheran. This form of Protestantism was transplanted with them to the soil in the earliest emigrations, and for a time they were allowed to enjoy their belief not only unmolested, but even under the protection of certain constitutional safeguards. But in the course of time it became apparent to the Russian authorities that a Lutheran Church on Russian soil might interfere seriously with the process of naturalization, and they commenced a series of measures, covert and open, to induce the Germans to abandon their belief and accept the Greek Church. For a time rewards and threats became quite effective, for there seemed in this matter to be a period of comparative indifference, and during this time the Government succeeded in having many of the children baptized in the Greek faith, and claiming all for this faith which were the offspring of mixed marriages.

The tide of reaction set in, however, after a time, and about six years ago the feeling in regard to the matter rose to the highest pitch. When the children baptized in the Greek Church began to see that this was to separate them from their families in a matter of extreme delicacy to all men, they became violent in their demands to be permitted to worship according to the faith of their fathers, and neither threats nor punishment sufficed to compel them to render obedience to the Greek priests. The whole land was deeply moved, and the result was that at a Diet sitting in Riga petitions and appeals came in showers from the clergy, scholars, and ordinary citizens, led on by large numbers of the titled classes. They claimed their old constitutional right of liberty of conscience, and besought the privilege of returning to the mother Church. The news of this unusual excitement reached St. Petersburg, and the Emperor decided to send a special commissioner to

make a tour through the country and report to him directly. By chance the charge fell upon an honest man, and his report did more toward unmasking Russian intrigue and bringing the true state of the case to the throne than any thing that has occurred during the whole controversy.

Count Bobrinsky, this Commissioner, visited but two circuits, being convinced when this was accomplished that his mere presence would call out immense demonstrations in favor of the Protestant religion. In one district he summoned an assembly of Greek priests, and put to them the direct question, whether a majority of their parishes were in favor of retaining and remaining in the State or Russian Church? Their reply was clearly negative, though against their desires and interests. In another district he bid two members from each congregation to meet him, and expected to see twenty-four delegates. He was favored with the presence of four hundred. In the next village six hundred men had gathered at the report of his coming, and in the next one thousand, until he was at last obliged to inform the authorities that he would absolutely refuse to confer with more than the number of delegates he had commanded to appear. Everywhere the people plead with him, with tears in their eyes, to carry their appeals to the throne for permission to return to the Lutheran faith, or at least to have their children thus baptized. Some fifteen came with a desire to remain in the Greek communion, presenting at the same time petitions for Government places. These interviews were all in the presence of the national priests, so that the restraint thereby exerted was decidedly in their favor. It was clearly developed that those who had left the Lutheran Church had not in conviction gone over to the Greek. They were thus virtually without any religious influence, and their moral condition was proportionally low. Of the number claimed in the statistics as belonging to the national Church not more than one tenth could be claimed as having any sympathy with it.

The report of the commissioner was honestly made to the Emperor Alexander, in accordance with this sad experience, accompanied with the regret that so many were untrue to the orthodox faith of the Empire, and the recommendation that they be permitted to return to their own faith, with the addition of the assurance that those who had abjured their faith

in 1845 had done so in the hope of improving their material condition, and that the children who had been baptized in the faith since that period now repudiated the action of their parents.

This report was by no means what the Emperor desired or expected; and, although he entertained the highest respect for a tried and faithful officer, he did not feel inclined to yield too easily to his suggestions. An audience of dignitaries was summoned to the Palace immediately, to listen to the Count's report, but among them was also the Archbishop of Riga, an ardent advocate of compulsory religion. This fact showed that the Emperor was not inclined to yield without a struggle. This Church official contested the truth of Bobrinsky's conclusions at least, and affirmed that a hasty journey of ten days gave him no opportunity to learn the true state of the case. He demanded the privilege of spending the summer among the parishes of his diocese, to have full opportunity to learn for himself the true state of the case. The Emperor, not having the least doubt of the character of this prelate's report, bid him do as he had suggested.

The adoption of this measure destroyed the hopes of the German Lutherans. The Archbishop came among them, but not on a pastoral visit in the true sense of the term. The so-called converts who desired to present to the hierarch their petitions to be permitted to return to the Church of their choice were intimidated with threats, and, when these were not successful, were overwhelmed with abuse at the very altars. In one instance a young Lutheran, who owed his connection with the Greek Church to the action of his parents, appeared as the representative of his colleagues, bearing an appeal to be released from bonds that bore heavily on their consciences. The Archbishop, in his anger at the self-possession of the appellant, declared him and his to be scabby sheep that would mar the whole flock, adding that they deserved to be expelled from the only true and orthodox Church. But the young peasant, who had a ready tongue, took advantage of this hasty and untimely accusation, and turning to his comrades, said: "You have heard that his Eminence declares us worthy of expulsion from the orthodox Church; let us go!" And in this mood the whole congregation followed him, leaving the

angry Archbishop and his train of priests in sole possession of the church.

Finding that this line of action did no good, the prelate undertook the investigation of the material condition of the peasants and laboring classes generally, and taught them that their troubles came mainly from the injustice of the proprietors and the inequality of the laws regarding them, declaring also to the German portion of the community that in many respects civil obligations had not been fulfilled in regard to them. These were such palpable truths that they commanded attention, and succeeded in turning their minds from religious to civil questions, and thus stirred up the whole province in political broils, in the midst of which the religious activity became weak, and indeed for a time was nearly suspended. The Archbishop had effected his purpose, and so had the Emperor; the Church question was smothered for the nonce, and the civil one could be handled by the civil authorities if it became troublesome. The distinguished services of the Archbishop were rewarded by the Emperor in the form of a diamond cross for the episcopal cap.

Of the many peculiar incidents that have attended this special struggle we give a few of those at our command, to show how deeply they penetrated into those domestic matters that we are accustomed to consider sacred from intrusions of any kind whatever. A high official of one of these provinces had married a lady who was a compulsory member of the Greek Church; she had been baptized in that faith. This fact was enough to constitute a mixed marriage, although the gentleman was a Protestant. A son was born to him, whom it was necessary to have baptized and placed on the Church records to give him a legitimate and legal status. The father determined to break the ban resting on mixed marriages, and assert his natural and parental right to bring up his child in the faith that he professed. He applied to a Lutheran clergyman to perform the rite; the latter could not do this without an open violation of the law, and refused. The father, permeated with the conviction of his faith that a child unbaptized is exposed to eternal condemnation in case of early death, resolved to perform the ceremony himself. This soon brought the diademed Archbishop into the strife; he brought an accusation against

the father, who was summoned to answer the charge before the Court tribunal of Riga. The State's attorney demanded one year's imprisonment in the penitentiary, his child and all children of his marriage to be taken from him and given over to believers in the orthodox faith, to be reared and educated in that belief. After a long trial the Court had the honest independence to give a verdict of acquittal. This decision was extensively illustrated by reference to Russian law and that of the provinces, as well as to capitulations and treaties, but was unfortunately marred in not being extended to all the provinces on account of special laws in some of them. An appeal was made to the High Court of St. Petersburg, where the matter dragged on for a long time, when the Emperor quashed the proceedings without any formal decision. The result was a decided victory against the Greek Church, but the proceedings produced a great degree of exasperation, seeing that this organization was so obstinately determined to interfere in the most delicate relations of domestic life.

The result of this trial of strength emboldened other Protestants that were parties to mixed marriages to bring up their children in their own faith. A lady of rank of the Reformed Church, whose husband was a compulsory Greek, also baptized her child herself. The case created great excitement, but she was not molested by the Greek priests, as they feared another rebuff from the courts. A still bolder act was perpetrated over a year ago by another lady of rank, who had also been forced into the Greek Church; she received the communion from the hands of an evangelical clergyman according to the Lutheran ritual, which of course excluded her from the Greek communion. She was prepared for the worst, but it was not thought advisable to interfere with her. These examples from above soon had their influence on the classes below. Two Lutheran women of the people of mixed marriage endeavored to withhold their children from Greek baptism. In one case, only a week after the birth of the child, the Greek priests appeared in the chamber of the mother and demanded the child for baptism. The mother begged a respite of a few weeks, when she would bring the child herself; but the priest became violent, and threatened father, mother, and nurse with imprisonment and transportation to Siberia. This so frightened the latter that

she snatched the child from the arms of the mother and gave it to the priest, while the excitement threw the mother into a dangerous fever and temporary insanity. In the other case the priest dragged the child away by main force, and it suffered so much by the violence and exposure that it died in a few days. The fathers of both children sued the priests, but after a sort of Chancery trial they were all acquitted. These outrages have greatly exasperated the people, and made the Greek priests still more unpopular. Just at this moment both parties stand in the sharpest antagonism to each other.

We can scarcely conclude this paper without devoting a few moments to the educational phase of this controversy, with the view of calling attention to the vast contrast between the Russian institutions properly so called, and those that exist in the Baltic Provinces under the German influence. As we have before observed, the Government finds it almost impossible to fill the chairs of the Universities in the interior. The University of Charkove has fourteen professorships now vacant, and this in the face of extraordinary efforts on the part of the Ministry of Instruction to supply them with teaching force, such as increase of salary, and foundation of scholarships for the training of instructors in foreign schools; and a recent issue of the "Odessa Journal" announces that the new University of that city needs a dozen professors, and in some cases for its most important chairs. Contrast this with the famous school of Dorpat in the Baltic Provinces, and Young Russia suffers severely. And the flourishing character of this school is maintained in the presence of difficulties arising from all sorts of petty interference on the part of the Government, and these have been long continued. Nicholas made every effort to reduce this University to a mere preparatory school for the education of civil officers, while its aspirations are to be the seat of the highest learning and culture of the realm. Alexander has treated it a little more kindly, but is determined to Russianize it as far as it can possibly bear it. No student may enter its halls without an extensive knowledge of the Russian language. This is an absolute impediment to many a young man who has no means or no inclination to acquire the Russian, and no use for it after all the labor devoted to it. The result is that not a few are turned away from a

learned career by the stumbling-blocks that are laid in their way.

About a year ago the Chief Inspector of the University and all the high schools of the provinces was ordered to correspond with the Ministry at St. Petersburg in the Russian tongue. It was known that the incumbent could not do this, and the intention was to get rid of him in this way, as it was supposed that he would resign; but he retained his post in the interest of his cause, and protested against the action. The result was the appointment of an ingrained Russian as sub-inspector, to do the correspondence, act as informer to the Government, and be ready to step into the place the moment it is vacant. One of the finest of the corps was recently displaced on account of the publication of a pamphlet reflecting on the ungenerous pressure of the authorities on the development of the institution. His place is still vacant and likely to be, since the Government has now determined that he who fills it must be able to deliver the lectures on Russian and Baltic history in Russian, and the national journals are now insisting that the lectures on Russian law must also be delivered in that tongue. The Emperor Nicholas had his own peculiar way of getting rid of uncongenial teachers; a mere suspicion or a simple dislike was enough to settle his purpose, and when a man was unfortunate in this way his fate was sealed. A noted teacher, now doing good service in Switzerland, found himself suddenly seized one day, placed in a carriage, and, under escort of a band of Cossacks, set down beyond the frontier, with an emphatic hint not to cross it again.

For the last three years efforts have been made to introduce the Russian into the high schools as a medium of instruction. History and mathematics were to be taught to mere boys in Russian; why just these branches is not so clear, as no one is aware that the language is especially rich or efficient in either of them. Thus far the effort has failed from sheer inability to carry it out. The children themselves are so set against it that they give it the nickname of "Arabic," and will neither study nor speak it unless forced to do so. If these branches are to be studied in Russian the youth of the provinces will know very little about them. But one great trouble that the enterprise meets in the beginning is to find native teachers of

the language. In all the Russian realm there is not a single normal school for the training of teachers ; while in the provinces there are no less than four. The result is so great a dearth of Russian teachers that it is said that even in Moscow a good teacher of Russian is not easily found. Under these circumstances the Germans of the provinces recommend that when one by chance comes to light, it were wiser to employ him in their own cities than to send him to the high schools of the Baltic. The German population of all this region is remarkably well-educated ; it is seldom that one is found who cannot read and write : the very peasants in the fields carry their hymn and prayer books with them to escape the eyes of the national priests, and the authorities declare that the proportion of their people that can read and write is even greater than in Prussia.

A systematic effort to force the Russian language on the country was made by ukase in 1869. The Emperor declared that all the crown authorities in the provinces should correspond with each other and with the superior authorities at the seat of Government in Russian. These national officers are few as yet, for nearly all are local ; but these few could not do it, and the measure is still imperfectly carried out. Shortly after its publication, the Emperor, on a general tour, visited Riga, and for the first time addressed the delegations in Russian, which few of them can understand, and which he himself can scarcely speak so effectively as he can the German, on account of the great superiority of the latter language over his own. The whole affair caused great exasperation, and set the entire press of the country by the ears in its discussion. The organs of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev make it a standing subject of debate, and preach from it the most proscriptive propositions, and thus the war goes on.

This gives the Russian party a capital chance to declaim about national unity and the incongruity of a foreign element in their midst, and this they do with little regard to the fact that these provinces are united to Russia by a series of solemn compacts extending over one hundred and fifty years, in nearly all of which distinct constitutional concessions are made to local language and religion. If the hotspurs of Russia could find time for a little investigation into general history they

would there find that about the hardest task a nation can undertake is to stamp out the language of another. They themselves have been trying the experiment on the Poles for a goodly period, and have not succeeded, though here the task should be more easy from the affinity of idiom and the total subjugation of the nation. In the case of the German provinces the undertaking is still more wild and unreasonable, from the fact that these may be made a source of strength and culture for the whole vast realm in its present career of progress and ambition.

ART. III.—OUR SPOKEN ENGLISH.

It was a wise conjecture of Mr. Marsh, that the new and altogether unparalleled strain put upon the English language in this country by the use of the literary dialect for all purposes, by all sorts of people, would result in new forms of phonetic corruption. It is the first experiment of democracy in speech. Hitherto the literary classes have had their choice, ripe, and flowing idioms mostly to themselves, and the circle has been so narrow that it has been easy to maintain a nearly uniform practice in orthoëpy, as well as in orthography. To this day, in all lands but ours, the masses speak dialects which they often share with the cultivated, who have, besides the common vernacular, a book-tongue for solemn or grave occasions. An Italian professor talks to his servants, wife, and children in dialect, but lectures to his students in the stately tongue used in books. In other countries, especially England, the dialects are less universally spoken; but every-where outside of America the rude, vulgar idiom is separated by a pretty broad line from its polite brother, and so takes off the brunt and waste of the worst sorts of usage.

Have we American-English dialects? Some facts favor an affirmative answer. There are certainly well-defined dialectical peculiarities. Two considerations, however, lead us to deny to these Americanisms the dignity or degradation of a dialect.

On the one hand, they only partially vary the spoken language; are rather hints of coming corruption, than systematic and universal corruption. Even a Hoosier speaks prevailingly in the book-language. On the other hand, none of these dialectical tendencies are the outgrowths of old, popular dialects. Making an exception here and there for a transplanted provincialism, most of our popular peculiarities are corruptions of book-words by people who did not inherit a low-born vernacular. The collision of languages in our country has developed some popular words which are not properly called dialectic, being nearly legitimate formations, and passing readily into the written tongue. *Hunker* might be cited as an example. It might be added that the incessant intermixture of our population by intermigration prevents the stagnation of any group of peculiarities into a vernacular for a province. It is difficult to see how a dialect can form under such conditions as ours,* and it is easy to believe that the old dialects of Europe must yield to the railroad and the school-master. The breaking up of a popular idiom in dense communities, where most are little learned in books, where all know their fellows from their youth up, and strange faces are rarely seen, is just such a task as the breaking up of a national speech. The Russian Emperor, who has attempted the last in Poland, would probably discourage our hope that Italy and Germany will succeed in the former.

It is quite another matter for a dialect to form in a population whose elements are changing every year. Only a national speech, however badly it be treated, can serve as a means of communication among the inhabitants of a village peopled from all parts of a vast nation. In spite of the varieties of accent, the mixture in some sections of different languages, and the broadly marked peculiarities of other sections, we conclude that we neither have, nor can ever have, true dialects. In a few years you may listen vainly for Hoosier on the Wabash or the Ohio,

*Professor Whitney is very hopeful of American-English, but he seems to think the danger of dialects to be worth some attention. "This [variety of usage] needs only a change in degree to make it accord with the distinction between any literary language which history offers to our knowledge, and any less cultivated dialects which have grown up in popular usage by its side, and by which it has been finally overthrown and supplanted." But when before, in human history, did a literary language have a national field all, or nearly all, to itself?—See *Language and the Study of Language*, p. 174.

and find all its peculiarities in every State of the Union, and many of them in that national literature which we are promised.

What we are to expect, and if possible avert, is the corruption of the literary language by every-day use on the tongues of a hundred millions of people scattered over half the surface of the globe, and mostly knowing a large part of their words at first only from books or newspapers.*

English orthoëpy is already subjected to severe pressure from the democracy, and it is doubtful whether the etymological canons will not have to yield to analogy established as a universal rule. So many people know how to read without knowing how to pronounce, our orthoëpical principles are so *entangling* to moderate intelligence, and the ignorant or half-educated may exercise such a constant pressure upon the educated few, that we are disposed to prophesy the victory of the people whenever they agree in opposing the scholars. If you wish to say *roman'ce* or *demon'strate*, you must daily fortify yourself against the influence of *ro'mance* and *dem'onstrate* hurtling into your ears from the popular tongue. Especially when words of foreign origin become an instrument of daily life, the pronunciation founded upon analogy must prevail. *Finance* will be accented on the first syllable by ninety-nine in every hundred Americans in spite of all the dictionaries and scholars, and before they are aware the scholars will be heard imitating the people.

It is worth considering whether these new popular conditions do not demand of scholars some effort to render our orthoëpy more simple, to come at first gracefully to concessions of things which will in the end be won even over their most stubborn resistance. There is no statute of limitations beyond which a word cannot wear a foreign accent. On one side, it parts with its *brogue* the next day after it gets into the newspapers; on the other, it keeps up a pretense of foreign flavor for an indefinite period. Since we have no rule ourselves, why not adopt the popular one?

In most cases the foreign air is sadly parodied in our speech. What Frenchman would recognize our *finan'ce*? It is neither French nor English; we have hung it up in an orthoëpical limbo,

* We refer here to the whole Anglican-tongued population of the world.

and will never have the courage to take it down. The people have naturalized it, and will force us to accept it as a citizen of the tongue. It is difficult to see why one of these changes from foreign to English pronunciation is any more safe or proper for extending through an indefinite period, and being accomplished only after a generation of scholars have wasted their protoplasm in nervousness and indignation at popular stupidity.

We have not yet fully comprehended that we are in a new world, which is not, and cannot be, governed by the few best speakers; certainly not upon the old system. Pure models in actual speech and the dictionary will both fail to reach the multitude, educated in the common schools, rushing into mercantile and political life, and becoming in turn models for admiring friends and constituencies. How few of them will ever doubt the application of the principle of analogy, or, if they doubt, will have or take the time to consult a dictionary. Orthography is in the hands of one or two hundred publishers, and these can successfully resist the ravages of democracy in the written forms; but the phonetic forms are under no such vassalage to any aristocracy.

The most that is now possible is to call attention to the influence of popular pronunciation, the difficulties of maintaining a heterogeneous orthoëpy, and the apparent necessity of modifying our canons, for accent at least, so as to give a wider application to the law of analogy, especially for new or recently-introduced foreign words.

A larger field is presented by the play of the laws of phonetic decay and renewal in the English spoken in America.

There is some vagueness in the use of the term phonetic decay, resulting from its application to three quite distinct linguistic phenomena. If all change is decay, the resolution of a consonant into its elements, or, more strictly, its separation into two or more letters, may be called decay; but whether it be a phonetic change is not absolutely settled, though it is probably such. In the Greek *dis*, and the Latin *bis*, (both from the Sanscrit *dvis*,) we probably have a labial and a dental developed from an older and more vague, or more complex, sound.* In the same way, a few early-formed consonants have furnished

* See Garnett's Philological Essays, p. 241.

by their expansion and division the consonantal wealth of modern tongues. This species of growth is so far removed from any proper decay that no case of it ought ever to be so designated.

Another set of phenomena involve *local* phonetic loss without affecting the sound-volume of the language. When *rondus* becomes *round*, local decay carries off the syllable *us*; but the sounds thus dropped from a word are retained in the speech, and local loss in number is attended with an increment in force. Scholars have attached great importance to these local losses, and not without reason, for they are the pivot of growth and decay in language. What they have sometimes failed to do is to mark the distinction between phonetic change affecting the sound-shell, and change in the intelligent contents of this shell. Max Müller's use of the French adverbial particle *ment* (Latin, *mente*) shows such a confusion of widely different things, the change noticed having but slightly affected the phonesis of the word in French, and not at all in Latin and Spanish. What has occurred is a change of meaning and use, arising from forgetfulness of the original meaning.*

There is still another set of facts, of wider application and more difficult of treatment, relating to the loss and renewal of the sounds of a language. Changes beginning in the attenuation of sounds are carried forward by the unconscious speakers until the phonetic elements concerned are pushed altogether out of the living tongue. These are true losses of phonetic wealth, even though they extend no further than the subtilizing of our vocal implements.

Unlettered dialects are probably protected by their poverty from being robbed by their speakers, who are believed to expend more energy upon their narrow phonesis than is used by cultivated people upon the same elements. The ear is so easily deceived in this kind of induction that one might challenge the claim for barbaric phonetic force if it did not seem to rest on well-supported principles. Since only so much strength will

* The attractive style of Max Müller disguises the logical blunder which runs all through his treatment of this subject. Phonetic decay riots in unwritten dialects, but is retarded or totally arrested in literary languages. Just the reverse statement is the key of Müller's argument. See "Science of Language," first series, pp. 54-79. All the changes referred to occurred in the dialectic stage.

be used for speaking, it is reasonable to assert that this force expended on a few sounds will give them greater volume than can be obtained when the same force is spread over a larger number. Besides, the barbarian or provincial peasant is believed to employ more energy in his vocal exertions than is usual in the elocution of his educated neighbors. It is to be desired that linguistic acoustics were enough studied, and sufficiently fortified by trustworthy observations, to justify implicit confidence in these general principles, for upon them rests the theory that dialects regenerate the phonesis of cultivated languages. That the ruder dialects renew the waste of words in the more advanced, but still unwritten ones, is established upon a very wide induction; but whether a quite modern form of waste, resulting from the preponderance of reading over speaking, and from other causes, is compensated by dialectic additions to vocabularies, and dialectic practice by their speakers, is a new question, dependent for its solution upon the relative strength, fullness, and volume of barbaric and provincial enunciation.

The question for this discussion is, Do we find reasons for believing that our spoken English is undergoing a process of gradual attenuation of its phonetic elements, and how far is this decay compensated by regenerating influences?

It may be that the opposing forces keep matters in even balance, but ours will not for that reason be a profitless inquiry. If there be any pleasure in witnessing a contest it is when the combatants are well-matched, and, if we are concerned for either contestant, we shall probably seek to lend him some assistance. Tendencies in language are often arrested by attracting public attention to what is going on.

Some general statements of facts neglected by our grammars will help us to estimate the problem. The first in order is the deficiency of our written notation. Our twelve English vowels are rather clusters of sounds than atomic elements. We see this in the *a* group, concerning which it has been debated whether there are four, five, six, or seven versions, and it is pretty clear that the evidence for more than four would make a good case for seventy while vindicating seven. There are two phonetic phenomena at the root of these diverging theories, one of which is that every new consonantal accompani-

ment slightly modifies the sound of the vowel, and the other is what the astronomers call the personal equation.

The same principles involve consonantal phonesis in a perpetual diversity. New combinations modify the several elements, and each man has his special rendering of all sounds, just as in a rural congregation every man may have a private notation for Mear or Dundee.* Of course the range of diversity is very narrow, and seldom passes the line beyond which it would be observed. It is only insisted that the variation exists, and establishes instability in what may be figuratively called the molecular constitution of our words. Dr. Latham speculates upon the fate of sounds which have become unstable; what destiny awaits a language all of whose phonal factors are already affected with instability? One thing seems clear, that is to say, that the slighter, feebler, more subtle forms may readily take precedence, and even monopolize the speech, if there be in operation causes tending to the diminution of the volume of sounds. The way is open for change; no implacable lines of law hem in and protect the phonetic atoms; each sound has already a great growth of resembling forms, and natural or artificial selection must do the rest. That such a result might occur, or rather that *some* change is to be expected, is sufficiently shown by the expansion of three or seven consonants into twenty or thirty in linguistic growth; and that a selection may take place in the elements of a sound really compound, is proved by the case of *bis* and *dis*, from *dis*, already cited.

It is rather suggested than asserted that another general principle may be applied to our phonesis with valuable results. We know that barbarians usually have few sounds. The Polynesian dialects are given only seven or eight by the grammars, and so long as the people remain in a low intellectual condition we should not expect them to develop new consonants; but, looking at the history of language, we should expect civilization to enlarge their phonesis. Well, then, does culture lead people to discriminate in sounds? If it does induce division

* Instances of variation which are conceded may be cited. The Greek *spiritus lenis* is an aspirate generally omitted in notation. It occurs in *ache*, in sounding which a bubble of breath precedes the *a*. Our *w* and *y* in *wet* and *yet* are *coet* and *iet*, to which, when sounded rapidly, an aspirate is added. This slight aspirate we mark; but in *union* the *io* takes on a stronger aspiration, which does not appear in our notation.

and increment, where does this tendency cease? Leaving out individual defects of acoustic apparatus for testing sounds, we must conclude that, since phonetic differences are produced and perceived by the intellect of man making use of vocal and hearing instruments, the more cultivated members of society must surpass the relatively ignorant in power to express a large phonetic notation. The complications of hereditary forces and early acquired habits are freely admitted. Still it may be believed that neither of these can permanently resist the backward movement of a language which, for other reasons, may be losing its phonetic wealth. If a people may rise from seven to twenty consonants through civilization, it cannot be doubted that they will return to seven when they fully return to barbarism.

How far the divergence of the many from the few in culture may affect phonetic expression is, of course, a matter of pure conjecture; that some divergence of phonesis will appear seems highly propable. We have an unusual proportion of readers in our population; but the really learned element is certainly not larger than in Germany, where the unlettered do not use the cultivated tongue. If we examine the facts we shall find that, although no completely satisfactory induction is possible, there is in our dialectic forms a decided tendency to obscurity or neglect of sounds. The writer has known persons in whose speech *a* had but three sounds; and every reader will bear witness that the sound of *a* in *command* is changed into another sound of the same letter by a large part of our population. The power to read does not confer the intellectual discrimination necessary for maintaining the integrity of phonal elements. We have, then, a phonetic apparatus brought to its present range of expression by the intellectual action of man rising into culture, and this instrument is placed in the hands, or mouth, of a whole population unprecedentedly, but still imperfectly, educated. Will they play the whole tune?

A profitable subject for observation would be to collect evidence upon the question whether reduction of the number of consonants and vowels is not an element in some of our dialectical variations.

With much less confidence that any useful result can follow inquiry, it is suggested that, since language never becomes so

wholly artificial as to escape utterly from the control of natural and intellectual laws, a transplanted phonesis may suffer from a change of natural and moral scenery. Man holds nothing simply because it has been once conquered from nature. Inventions, arts, and even languages have been lost. Our spoken English grew in another soil, its phonal music was learned in communion with other seas and mountains, and other climatic conditions favored the rendition by human organs of the sounds we are discoursing under new skies. Unhappily, we know less than we need to know how phonetic systems suffered or expanded in the old migrations; for it is open to a doubter to claim that the old alphabets do not cover the whole breadth of the phonesis.

Some precious facts, precious even though not altogether pleasant, seem to vindicate a place for natural law in the current movement of language. American elocution is less round and full-volumed than English, and ours is almost universally marked by a nasal quality unknown in the home-land of our tongue. It is amusing to hear the citizens of different sections accusing each other of a nasal twang which is heard all over our country.

The reduction of volume, especially in chest sounds, and the play of our noses in our English, would seem to be capable of only one explanation, and that is, that they are a tribute paid to the empire of climate. The only other supposition is pure conjecture, and applies to nasal sounds; that the collision of English in this country with many other tongues—the effect of these collisions reaching at length the whole body of our people—as with Dutch in New York, German in Pennsylvania, French in several sections, African dialects in the South, and Indian dialects every-where, that these collisions might, by some unknown phonetic equation, develop a nasal element in our language.

Even those changes which seem to be dependent upon our will are by no means under the control of caprice. All men naturally seek to reduce the exertions necessary to procure the satisfaction of their desires, or, to borrow from political economy, to buy in the cheapest market. It requires an effort to speak, and we observe here the same fact which appears in other fields of action, that man is not inclined to indulge in

superfluous industry. If a combination is difficult, it is made easy by changing or omitting sounds. We have an example in *strenth* for *strength*. Take this series of steps toward facility: *I do not know, I don't know, I don know, I'd 'now*. If the last will buy the goods, it will be the common currency.

Nothing is gained by calling this laziness; men are not required to do works of supererogation in language any more than they are in religion. For colloquial purposes the shorter forms are preferable; and we should not complain of their use if they could be set aside, branded dialectic, and restrained from mixing in literary society. But our dialectic abbreviations hover constantly on the verge of the cultivated speech, and form in us habits of negligence, which appear in the graver forms of expression. The evil fruit is gathered, not only in the lax utterance of speakers, but also in the accustoming of all ears to accept a part of a word, or a part of a sound, for the whole, in an intellectual refining of our speech down toward a barren symbolism. The moment we have reached a familiar acquaintance with the attenuated skeletons, we begin to loathe the full-fleshed and living harmonies as a kind of rant or affectation.

An example of a progress toward phonetic loss, attended with a repugnance to full enunciation, is afforded by the sound *r*, which has altogether lost with us its full rolling power. A faint shadow remains in our pronunciation of initial and final *r*'s, but in medial positions it is now rarely heard at all. *Lord, word*, are uttered as though *r* had become a vowel; and the worst of it is, that these phonetic sinners are often people who ought to know better.*

But the worst feature of the case is, that a full *r* is unpleasant to our ears, being associated by some with vulgar bogs, being painful to most by its boisterous noisiness.†

The use of a literary speech for the household life of millions of people is an experiment, all the results of which cannot be

* The statement in the text is too favorable to our pronunciation of final *r*'s. *Roar* is rendered *roah*; and one of our popular magazines once published a poem, with a chorus, in which the rhyme required a final *r* to stand for the sound of *a* in fall.

† Inasmuch as some of our Indian dialects are deficient in this sound, it is open to inquire whether climate is not an element in the change here noted.

wholesome. The volume of our phonetic elements must be affected by force of the general principle, that the needs of domestic life are satisfied by a narrower phonesis, and therefore the tendency must be steadily toward loss or attenuation, as well as by the operation of special home influences among our people. On the rule that we do not habitually make needless vocal exertions, family life requires a minimum of phonal breadth.

The effects of isolation and familiarity, of common sympathies and employments, find their fullest result in the dialects of tribes; similar conditions in our households, taking up, as they do, an unusually large share of our lives, cannot be exactly similar, for we start with a different intellectual capital; but they cannot fail to appear somewhere in our speech. We may learn where to expect them by examining some less close associations.

A company of carpenters, working together and conversing about the technical matters of their trade, will unconsciously reduce their vocal efforts in technical terms to a minimum, and the inexpert would catch only a part of the sounds. But if one of these carpenters were required to speak with a person ignorant of the trade, he might quite unconsciously give a more distinct rendering of such terms; but this would depend upon the strength of his careless habits. A sailor, on the other hand, says *bos'n*, and scarcely recognizes a landsman's *boatswain* as the same word. The effect of these class associations is to cut down the words and sounds to the merest skeletons, not to say shadows.

Now in a larger way home-life attenuates the phonesis of our people, especially of our children. Many forms of speech have often to be repeated, and become so familiar that segments of them will represent the whole. Take a book and ask a child to read from another copy while you follow by the eye, and you will not need that he shall speak distinctly, for you know what he should say. In a similar way, we listen knowing what is to come, and stimulating our friends to hasten by significant signs that we are going faster than their tongues. So our vocal efforts insensibly fall to the actual necessities of the fireside.

Another element of this household corruption of speech is our familiarity with the habits of speech and intonations of the

persons with whom we pass most of our lives. The principle involved may be tested by a public speech. If we listen to one person weekly for years, our attention is less and less strained as we grow accustomed to his voice and elocution. A stranger in the same place will ask more attention without being less distinct in enunciation. The grammatical order of words, usually nearly invariable, also economizes attention in the household. The principle cuts a large figure in the formation of varieties in dialects.* A Swiss hotel servant will speak any European language with a faultless intonation; but he has really only learned a set of sentences by rote, and if you change the order of his words or your own he is immediately put to confusion. What is called "Pigeon-English" in China and San Francisco shows a yet more helpless dependence upon the recurrence of certain terminal sounds. In the family, children certainly learn words; but they also learn to look for them in set combinations, and to understand them when half uttered.

The household competes with the rostrum and the pulpit for the honor of fixing the standard of energy in utterance. Where dialects prevail in the family, the standard of correct taste is left to be maintained by public speaking of various kinds, in which the mere fact that many are to be addressed induces phonetic exactness. Italian is but slightly if at all affected by home use; it is only a public dress for thought, and the precision and exacting accuracy with which it is delivered is almost painful, and seems unnatural to foreign ears. It is nothing more, however, than the strange phenomenon of a whole and unimutilated phonesis being habitually reproduced. Contrast our own usage, which is so far short of this exacting precision that any speaker who should utter each sound distinctly would be listened to with pain and accused of affectation. Popular use of English in the family, and elsewhere, has probably produced this dislike of a full phonesis by familiarizing us with a kind of phonal symbolism in which a part represents perfectly the whole. Why should men make useless efforts? If clipped

* Differences between closely related dialects are largely made up of simple changes in the order of words, or the substitution of common words for each other, the phenomena of phonesis being identical throughout the group. The Genoese group is an illustration of this fact; and yet the inhabitants of conterminous valleys, or burghs, cannot speak with each other without a sense of difficulty.

coins pass current, who will pay a premium for unmutated dollars? The tendency of popular usage to diminish volume of utterance is shown by some phenomena attending the learning of a foreign speech. One may perfectly master French under a teacher in New York, and yet be quite at a loss to understand the French heard in social life in Paris. The instructor unconsciously, or of set purpose, cultivates a full phonetic expression, such as is heard in the best public speaking. But only fractions, larger or smaller, of these phonetic elements are used by Frenchmen; the stranger must learn to take a part for the whole before spoken French will become intelligible. Foreigners, in whatever strange land they may wander, complain that the natives speak indistinctly. Even Italian, when used for conversation, loses some of its phonetic richness; and if it ever becomes the social speech, even of the better half of the nation, its voweled magnificence must decline.

Another neglected orthoëpical phenomenon facilitates the ravages of carelessness in speaking English. At an early stage in a language there are commonly several canons of good taste which have about equal importance; but, by a kind of volitional-natural selection, some one of these takes the supreme place of law, and tends to destroy all the others. This *stress point* of orthoëpy is seldom, if ever, the same in two really distinct speeches. In Greek, it probably lay in the peculiarly perfect system of accentuation; in Latin the prosodical value of the vowels was, without much room to doubt, the field of orthoëpical stress. In Italian, the fullness of the vowels takes precedence of other canons; and in English, what we call accent devours all other rules.

One of the most obvious facts is that popular usage exaggerates the point of stress whenever it is simple enough to be popularly used at all. Genoese vocal expression is in this way a parody on the stress point of Italian, a reckless contempt of the rights of consonants, being one of its features.*

This tendency appears in English in the increasing laxity of the pronunciation of the unaccented syllables, accompanied by an increase of accentual stress. It is a common observation that vowels not under the accent lose their distinctive quality.

* Genoese elides the consonants, without blending the vowels, and four vowels are sometimes uttered one after the other in the same word. Besides, these vowels are as plump as Tuscan wheat.

Initial vowels suffer least, preserving in some cases (as *ache*) their proper sounds, but in others (as *accept* and *except*) falling into confusion before a consonant favored with the accentual prerogative. But, in the medial and final positions, popular pronunciation has no mercy for the individuality of vowels; they are all consigned to the limbo of a universal *u*. The identity of the spoken word seems to be passing into the accent, and, if this be placed where we are accustomed to find it, all the rest of the word is taken in fractions of sounds.

The stress of English orthoëpy is wonderfully simple and convenient for popular use; and, if proper care be taken in our public schools and colleges to counteract the tendency here noticed, we may congratulate ourselves on this happy facility of popularization; but should these tendencies continue at their recent rate of progress, we may find ourselves in the year 1950 with a national dialect rather than a national speech; or, if the statement be preferred, a spoken English departing widely from its *orthographical* brother.*

The universal diffusion of newspapers and books is another new fact in the history of languages, and the first and most marked results of this influence will appear in the English spoken in America. The period over which the action of this force has extended is so brief, that any discussion of it must partake of the nature of speculation. That considerable consequences must appear is evident from a mere contrast. Most languages have spent their lives mostly upon human tongues, rarely passing into literature at all, and then only for a very restricted form of existence. The ear has shaped, guided, and preserved their development. And in the outcome every language must submit to acoustic predominance.†

But our language is addressed very largely to the eye; and it is this which renders orthographical classicism so very easy, for all have a common interest in the conservation of familiar forms.‡ The contrast thus presented between them, for example, Anglo-Saxon and our American speech, raises an

* Space forbids illustration of a fact known to most readers, that English shows historical tendencies to this divorce of orthography and orthoëpy.

† That is to say, whenever a spoken tongue or dialect, departs widely from its orthography, a literature may be expected in the popular branch, and the classic will pass away.

‡ Orthographical (by a natural blunder usually called phonetic) reform is re-

expectation of wide-reaching consequences. Beyond this, we must advance by speculating upon the value and significance of a few facts; and any one may lawfully expound the facts in another and more hopeful manner.

The independence of the eye in reading is established only by much practice. From passages in the Latin rhetoricians, one may doubt whether the eye had obtained this emancipation among the educated classes at Rome. We observe that a child needs to repeat his words to his ear in order to understand them, and older persons of very little education seem to require the same acoustic aid to intelligence. The power to read silently is acquired by practice, and most readers of newspapers have mastered the difficulty. But when this power has been acquired, do the two renderings, oral and visual, subsist independently? Certainly not, at first. An attentive self-observer may detect a kind of muffled whisper going on while the eye runs over the symbols of sounds. It has been maintained that this mind-reading is always a reproduction of the sounds to the mental ear—the sounds are fancied, and if they are not the reading is interrupted. Whether this be universally and necessarily true is of course a matter for faith. We do observe, however, that we unravel tangled places by reading aloud or consciously muttering the different passages.

Practically, however, the eye acquires independence of the ear, and the written language becomes a mere symbolic notation divorced from any consciously known relation to sounds. The apparent necessity of phonetic expression is a fruit of habit, and passes away whenever vocal exercise is wholly relinquished for a considerable period.

If, therefore, a people read more than they speak, it would seem to follow that the spoken and written language would more and more separate; the latter becoming a notation for the eye, and the former ceasing to be under the control of the literary orthography. Even if the habit of reading cannot extinguish the phonetic accompaniment, it certainly can and does attenuate it, and the results in this case must be as disastrous as in that of total loss of a mental phonesis.

sisted by an overwhelming majority of those who form public opinion, and the democracy are here conservative. If you doubt, print books in a reformed spelling and see whether the masses will buy them.

These are some of the reasons for supposing that our spoken English is losing orthoëpic volume, and that, if the forces at work to produce decay are not arrested or checked, or balanced by counter-agents, the national speech will more and more separate from the old standards, lay aside phonetic elegance and compass, and become a popular dialect, with the novel peculiarity of being the speech of a continent.

The task of phonetic regeneration is usually performed by dialects, which locally renew by furnishing new compounds for those which have been corrupted to the verge of annihilation, and replenish the volume of phonesis by the interaction of dialect and language pronunciation. The dialect usually has fewer sounds with fuller volume, and, when its words pass into the language, they carry, and for some time retain, their wealth of lusty energy,* just as foreign words keep for some time their old accents. The effort to speak these words will extend to others, and so swell out the volume of the sounds affected. What our dialect does for one class of sounds, another may do for another class, and thus a living force, springing out of dialects, constantly renews the wasting literary speech.

English at home, that is, in England, is surrounded by a family of dialects which, doubtless, act powerfully against decay of phonetic energy. The dialect dictionaries give us from twenty thousand to forty thousand words now in use in the dialects of England, and not in use in the language. The words of English proper do not number forty thousand, for technical terms and the most recent additions to the language are not, phonetically speaking, truly English. They are not yet under the phonetic regimen of our tongue. Here, then, is another English speech of almost equal etymological extent surrounding the literary tongue and pressing up into its society. These dialects, taken together, cover the whole range of English phonesis, and express it with more strength. Those who speak these rude vernaculars learn the book-language, and

*If it should be claimed that the theory of barbarian wealth in a narrow phonesis is not established, we should fall back upon the fact, chiefly operative in modern life, but equally applicable to dialects intermingling at any period, that a foreign word requires more vocal effort than a native word. This is solid ground.

bring to its expression the energy which the dialects require of their voices. The influence of their example extends to others, and gradually to all, and dialect words from time to time enter the book-English and reinforce its sounds.

It is probably true that the uneducated classes speak with more force over a smaller range of sounds than the educated classes. In other words, that a dialectic phonesis will always prevail among those who know little or nothing of books. If this be true, then we shall see how the non-reading classes do for us in this country what the dialects do for the English—counteract in some degree the decay of our pronunciation.

It is not meant that such a countervailing force is equal to the destructive force. Probably all the opposing forces do not match the destructive in our American-English. If they did so the decay would be unobserved.

But this is not the only barrier put up in this country against phonetic lapse. English is here subjected to a greater external pressure than in England. All the languages of the civilized world are imported by their speakers, and brought into living contact with the English. Dutch, German, and French have from the first contested the ground with the language of the Pilgrim Fathers, and in some sections they have taken a place in the etymology. Portions of New York are covered by Dutch influences, and a class of true dialect words arise out of this fact. In portions of Pennsylvania German has been long spoken with similar consequences. The German spoken there does not perhaps act sensibly upon English etymology, but it does act on English phonesis. In Louisiana and other parts of the Union, and in Canada, French has been spoken longer than English, and it influences both etymology and orthoëpy.* These cases would once have been local, and would have produced no marked effect on the rest of the country; but in our day rapid and incessant intercommunication spreads them over the entire land.

The Indian dialects have doubtless done more for us than we know. The earliest periods of our history were marked by considerable intercourse between the savage and his invading oppressor. The names taken from the aborigines were at first sounded in imitation of them, and to this day they lay an un-

* Add African dialects in the Southern States.

wonted tax on our vocal organs. Old inhabitants of Chicago expend more exertion upon that name than do their children.

We have thus far referred only to languages which have been in the country from the first, and of fruits of these early struggles between them and our language; but the emigration of Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, Celts, Spaniards, Russians, Poles, Turks, and Chinese must be affecting the phonesis at this moment to an extent which we cannot hope to measure. The total phonesis of the race seems represented in these languages, which, brought to our shores by foreigners, are spoken by them for a generation or two side by side in the same mouths, and in curious intermixture of etymology and phonesis with English. If, then, dialectic regeneration acts feebly with us, foreign regeneration—if an awkward term be allowed—exercises a much greater force than dialects usually do.

Even in England this foreign element is very strong. The different branches of Celts contribute each a quota of phonetic force. The Scotch Highlanders, the Welsh, the Mankemen, the Irish, bring into English pronunciation the energy and breadth of their own mother dialects. But this is not all; London is more picturesque in the nationalities of its people than New York. To representatives of all the peoples who come to us she adds natives of her antipodal possessions—Hindoo doctors and Australian peasants. But we not only receive immigrants representing all other countries, we travel and learn the speech of other nations, and in our own mouths reverse the process of our new citizens to produce the same result. And this last fact must be taken into account as acting in every direction and upon all tongues. In an early age two tribes having four consonants each, by uniting, doubled their phonetic wealth. In our age cultivated tongues, by interchange, make common stock of the phonesis of mankind.

Commerce and literary enterprise stimulate men to learn the languages of each other, and the number of persons who can speak two or three is perhaps doubled every year. There is, in every country, a set of men who speculate upon the probable triumph of their own tongue over all others. They usually know nothing of philology, and little of any other than their own tongues; but it is worth while to notice what effects do actually follow the rapid intercommunication of peoples. It is

not the extension of the territory of one speech so much as the enrichment of the vocabularies of all, and the less apparent, but not less certain, enrichment of the phonesis of all. And in this interchange it is the free traders who will triumph. The language which borrows most, which most rapidly absorbs the linguistic wealth of its neighbors, will most nearly realize the dream of a universal language. The tongue which refuses to part with its gold for foreign goods because it believes the gold of more value than the goods will not profit by the commerce of language, or extend the boundaries of its empire.* English has ever been a voracious consumer of foreign vocables. If it continued to devour the speech of every people it might, if it did not burst in the effort, become universal by swallowing all others. This much is certain, that for a long period to come the incessant action of foreign phonesis upon ours will help repair the ruin made by those decaying forces which are eating out the heart of our sound-system.

The influence of classical study and classically-derived nomenclature upon our phonesis ought not to be omitted. The first invigorates the phonesis of all scholars, and indirectly affects all speakers. The second is even more powerful. The number of persons who are interested in these studies is large, and the words given them to speak are numerous and sufficiently difficult of utterance.

Some readers may furnish an unconscious support for this argument by inquiring whether, after all, it is not the prerogative of a higher civilization with a vast literature to dispense with a full phonetic system. One might reason that only the arts of oratory and poetry are strictly dependent upon orthoëpy, and that these are already sickly, and probably destined to pass away with the diffusion of books and their culture. What orator can compete with a newspaper, and what promise is there of a crop of poets? But such speculations, though ever so plausibly supported, depart so far from the plain world in which we live, and imply such an immense advance along the whole line of civilization, that it is hardly safe to found optimist hopes upon them.

Our spoken English is the theater of a great conflict, in

* French translates foreign names when this can conveniently be done.

which it has already lost orthoëpical wealth. Whether these losses are the beginning of wide-spread ruin, the first steps toward a national dialect, and thereby to a new written tongue, and the loss of the treasures contained in the classic speech, depends upon the relative strength of the destructive agencies and those reinforcements of the regenerating army which have entered the field too recently to have tested their prowess.

ART. IV.—ORIENTAL INFLUENCE ON WESTERN THOUGHT AND CIVILIZATION.

AT the earliest historical period the inhabitants of Europe known as the Indo-Germanic races give striking indications of their Asiatic origin. According to Professor Max Müller a large number of their etymological roots exist almost identically in the Sanscrit, and there are remarkable affinities of grammatical forms and inflections which are inexplicable but upon the theory of a common origin. Later in the historical period we discover palpable proofs of Asiatic migration. Time after time have vast hordes of nomads from the great central plateau of Asia precipitated themselves upon the plains of Europe, leaving numerous evidences of Eastern origin in the languages, physical appearance, and national characteristics of their descendants.

But we design here to refer more especially to the intellectual influences exerted by Oriental philosophy and science upon European thought. The position of the Attic peninsula, almost on the frontier between Europe and Asia, its intimate relations with the East, and the receptive character of the Hellenic mind, caused Greek philosophy to be deeply imbued with the spirit of Orientalism. The Greek traditions all refer to the East as the fountain-head of all knowledge. Athens was itself an Egyptian colony. From Phœnicia Cadmus brought those primitive characters which are the elements of all European literature. Thales derived the germs of his philosophy from Egypt, whose religious creed in turn was deeply tinged with the older Hindoo thought. The Indian doctrine of metempsychosis in the teachings of Pythagoras betrays the

source of his leading tenets. The Eleatic philosophy, with its superadded theories of emanation from the deity and final absorption into his essence, presents a still greater resemblance to the dreamy pantheism of India. The Greek intellect seized with avidity the subtleties of Eastern thought, which will be found to pervade not only the ideal philosophy of Plato, but the keener dialectics of Aristotle.

The Persian campaign of Alexander was fraught with very important consequences to the intellectual history of the world. Not the least of these was the founding of the city of Alexandria upon the breaking up of his empire, and its subsequent influence on the civilization and literature of Europe. That influence has hardly been excelled even by that of Athens itself. It made an impression on the intellectual career of the West so powerful and enduring that we feel its results to this day. In the dynasty of the Ptolemies literature and science found a patronage more munificent than that of Pericles, of Lorenzo il Magnifico, or of Louis le Grand. Never had learning such a comprehensive organization and such vast endowments as in the Museum of Alexandria. Neither the French or Florentine Academies, nor the Royal Societies or Universities of Europe, so fostered it. It became the university of the world. At one time fourteen thousand students thronged its halls, and its library contained seven hundred thousand books and scrolls.

The glorious achievements of the Alexandrian school in physical science anticipated many of the discoveries of modern times. The geometrical demonstrations with which Euclid delighted the acute Alexandrian mind two thousand years ago are studied to-day in all the schools of Europe. The Mechanical Construction of the Heavens of Ptolemy, no mean prototype of the Principia, calculates the size of the earth from a measurement of a degree on the shores of the Red Sea. Although much of the Alexandrian learning perished during the darkness and confusion of the Middle Ages, yet much was preserved by the Arabs, and became the germ of modern science. The magnitude and importance of the boon conferred upon the Hellenistic races by the Septuagint translation of the Scriptures confer an imperishable renown upon the name of Ptolemy Philadelphus, at whose command it was undertaken. How remarkable that providence which delivered all the East into the

hands of the Greeks, that their language, the most copious and flexible ever spoken, might become almost universally understood, and be thus the fitting vehicle for the diffusion of the knowledge of the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent!

The progressive conquest of the Greek monarchies by the Roman power was still another step of preparation toward that momentous event which was to mold the destinies of all future time. At this juncture a new element was introduced into society, which was destined

"To heaven with its fiery leaven
All the hearts of men forever."

"Every-where," to use the fine image of Kingsley, "the mangled limbs of the old world were seething in the Medea's chaldron, to come forth whole and young and strong." The old faiths were fading out of the firmament of human thought, before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, as the stars of midnight vanish at the dawn of day. The old gods reeled upon their thrones, and, like Dagon before the ark, fell before a mightier than they;

"They feel from Judah's land
The dreaded Infant's hand;
The rays of Bethlehem blind their dusky eyes."

The oracles were stricken dumb, their shrines became deserted, Pythia staggered on her tripod,

"And Dodona's oak swang lonely
Henceforth to the tempest only."

But the purity of the Christian faith became speedily corrupted. The effects of Oriental influence were seen in the numerous heresies that infected the Church in the early Christian centuries. Alexandria, especially, became a very alembic for the fermentation of thought. Neo-Platonism, that hybrid between Christianity and Paganism, tried to refine away the grossness of the ancient superstitions into a beautiful *mythus*—a sublime inner meaning—in harmony with the doctrines of Christianity. Christianity itself became strongly imbued with this allegorizing spirit. Origenism and Mysticism marred the symmetry and corrupted the simplicity of the primitive faith. Even the acute mind of Augustine, and through him Latin Christianity, was much affected by this visionary philosophy.

These antagonistic principles thus introduced into the Church—this putting the new wine of Christianity into the old bottles of Heathen philosophy—produced the usual result. The fermentation and mutual repression of these antipathetic elements rent the Church into a thousand factions, schisms, and theosophisms. Excommunications, fanatical recriminations, hurtling anathemas, and cries of maranatha filled the air.

It was a presbyter of Alexandria that originated the terrible Arian controversy which for so many centuries rent the Church and deluged the earth with blood. It spread rapidly to the West, and was warmly espoused by the Gothic races. The mutual persecutions of the opposing factions were most virulent. Witness the sneer of Gibbon concerning “the furious contests, which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the *Homooousians* and the *Homoiousians*.”

In the East, too, arose the pernicious system of monachism, which has exerted such a powerful influence on Western society. The practice was common to the Chinese Boodhist, the Indian fakir, the Persian dervish, and the Egyptian eremite. The generic idea among all these is the Manichæan doctrine of the impurity of the flesh, derived in turn from the still older notion of the antagonistic principles of good and evil—Ormuzd and Ahriman. The Essenes among the Jews and the Therapeutæ of Egypt presented the leading features of the conventual order of later days. The hermits of Mesopotamia grazed naked on all fours, and the deserts of Syria and Egypt swarmed with monks long before they were known in Europe. Those lonely anchorites

“ Beneath Engedi’s palms
Pacing the Dead Sea beach,”

or seemingly spawned from the mud of the Nile, like the ancient plague of frogs, are all the offspring of the theosophico-ascetic spirit which pervaded the entire East. Monachism was transplanted from the East to Europe in the fourth century, and soon no lonely isle, no desert shore, no gloomy vale, was without its laura or monastery. Differences of climate and of race, however, greatly modified its features, the Western monk never exhibiting the delirious fanaticism which characterized the Eastern confraternities.

The great political and religious convulsion of which the East became the theater in the seventh century exercised a most powerful influence on the arts, literature and civilization of the West. One of the strangest phenomena in history is the rapid spread of that gloomy fanaticism, which in a single century extended its baleful shadow from Bokhara to Cordova, from the Indus to the Loire. Its fierce and fiery energy swept away the corrupt Christianity of the East, save some lingering remnants in the secluded Nestorian valleys, in the Armenian monasteries, and among the mountains of Abyssinia. The schools of Alexandria were scattered, its library destroyed, its glory extinguished. But ere yet the early flush and vigor of conquest passed away the Saracens applied their eager energies to the cultivation of learning. It is their greatest glory that they overran the domains of science as rapidly as the territories of the earth. They soon became heirs of the learning of Alexandria. They eagerly adopted the philosophical method of Aristotle. They swept the monasteries of the Levant and the Ægean for the writings of the Grecian sages. From the Arabic translations of these much of the literature and science of Europe is derived. An intense national life and preternatural vigor was developed. Their active commerce from Alexandria and Cyprus civilized the maritime state of Europe.

But the rapid expansion of the caliphate exhausted the native population and led to political divisions. Hence its glory was but transient. It contained the germs of its own dissolution, and these soon began to develop. It was like some gorgeous flower, which rapidly expands, soon ripens, and as swiftly fades; or like the fair and fragile maidens of the East, who reach a splendid though precocious maturity, but soon become faded and withered.

But it was in Spain that the Saracenic influence was most permanent and most potent on European thought. Sweeping like a tornado over northern Africa on their fiery desert barbs, the cloud of Mussulman cavalry paused but briefly at the straits of Gades, and planted the crescent on European soil, there to wage deadly conflict with the cross for eight long centuries. Filling the land like an army of locusts, they found slight barriers in the Pyrenees, but swarmed across their rugged heights, till the fertile plains of France, from the Garonne to the Rhone, became subject to the sway of the Caliphs.

It was an hour of most eminent peril to Europe. Its future destiny was in the balance. It was the crisis of fate for the entire West. Would the conquering tide roll on and overwhelm the nascent nationalities that were every-where struggling into life, or was the period of its ebb at hand? Should European cities bristle with a grove of minarets or with a forest of spires? Should the superstitions of the mufti and the Saracenic mosque supplant the worship of Christ beneath cathedral dome? Should the son of Abdallah or the Son of Mary receive the homage of the West? Should we to-day—for the destinies of the New as well as of the Old World were involved—be wearing the fez or turban and praying toward Mecca, or be Christian freemen? These were some of the questions depending apparently upon the issues of the hour.

The Moors meanwhile press on. They overspread the plains of Burgundy and Aquitaine, and pitch their tents on the banks of the Loire. They are already half-way from Gibraltar, to the North of Scotland, to the Baltic, and to the confines of Russia. But the fiat had gone forth from the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of the universe: Hitherto shall thou come and no further! Then, broken like the waters and scattered like the spray, that wave of invasion recoiled from the shock of the Christian chivalry, and ebbed away forever from the fields of *la belle France*. Europe was safe! Charles Martel and the peers and paladins of France smote the infidels as with a hammer of destruction.

Thus checked in mid-career, and their fiery strength exhausted, the Saracens settled down behind the Pyrenean wall. Here they won laurels far more glorious than those of war. In the cultivation of literature, art, and science they led the van of Western nations. When Arabian civilization was at the zenith of its glory in Spain, the rest of Europe, except a small area around Rome and Constantinople, was in a condition of barbarism. While the Frankish Kings traveled in state in a rude cart drawn by oxen, the Saracen Emirs rode through their fair and flourishing provinces on prancing Andalusian chargers richly caparisoned with housings of Cordova leather, with golden stirrups and jeweled bridle, amid the clash of silver cymbals, and with flashing scimitars of the famed Toledo steel. While the European serf wore hose of straw and jer-

kins of ill-tanned hide, the Arab peasant was clothed with garments of linen, cotton, or woolen, and the nobles in damask stuffs and silks. London and Paris were mere congeries of wretched wooden structures, penetrated by narrow, crooked, dark and miry lanes, seven hundred years after Cordova and Toledo abounded in well-paved and lighted streets and bazars, adorned with noble marble edifices, mosques, baths, colleges, and fountains. While the strongholds of the European sovereigns were little better than stables—unglazed, bare-walled, and rush-strewn—the lieutenants of the Caliphs held their divans in palaces of oriental magnificence, with mosaic floors and ceilings fretted with gold, with shady alcoves and stately colonnades, where painted glass softened the light, Moorish music lulled the senses, musky odors filled the chambers, and fairy fountains cast up their silver spray; where caleducts in the walls cooled the air, and hypocausts under ground warmed the waters of the bath. Exquisite arabesques, ivory couches, graceful cabinets of sandal or citron inlaid with mother-of-pearl, softest carpets, richest silks, gold, silver, malachite, porcelain, alabaster, miracles of the loom and needle, filigree, and jewelry, attested the Sybaritic luxury of the inhabitants. Yet the lord of all this splendor confessed to have enjoyed only fourteen happy days in his life!

While a great part of Europe was a pathless forest or morass where roamed the wild boar and wild ox, upon the fertile *vegas* of Granada and Cordova waved the yellow corn and flashed the golden orange and citron. There, too, gleaned the snowy bolls of the cotton-plant, and glistened the silky plumage of the sugar-cane. The jasmine bowers and rose gardens of Shiraz seemed transplanted to the fairy courts and colonnades of the Alhambra. While the ignorant European peasant fled in sickness to the nearest relic shrine, or had recourse to the mumbling rites of a superstitious monk, the Moor found in the public hospitals the best scientific treatment of the age. Although the followers of the False Prophet they honored the unity of God, and looked with aversion on the saint and relic worship of the races north of the Pyrenees. An enlightened jurisprudence held the place of the wager of battle and ordeal by fire, which obtained throughout the rest of Europe. They defended their polygamic institution by patriarchal pree-

edent, and contrasted it with the sinful concubinage or unnatural celibacy of the Monastic orders. They were munificent in public charities, and their toleration of the religions of their Roman Catholic subjects and of the Jews was ill-requited by the bloody persecutions and expatriation of themselves and their Hebrew fellow-sufferers by the Catholic sovereigns of Spain.

The revenue of the Moors was greater than that of any kingdom in Europe. They anticipated by four hundred years the maritime enterprise of Venice and Genoa. A fleet of a thousand ships moored in the harbors of Barcelona, Malaga, and the Mediteranean ports. They had factories on the Tanais and the Euxine. They traded with Constantinople, Cyprus, Alexandria, and, overland, with India and China. Of their learning we can only judge by the relics which have survived the fierce wars of the peninsula. The Spanish crusade against the Moors was also a war against science, literature, and art. Spain drained herself of her life-blood by the expulsion of the Moriscoes. When the Christian literature of Europe was shallow and absurd, consisting of lying lives of the saints or disquisitions on the "Light of Tabor," the Moors translated and zealously studied the philosophy and science of the Greeks. Though much of their learning has been lost because Europe was incapable of retaining it, yet much has been preserved to the present day. But even these scattered fragments give evidence of a glorious body of literary and scientific knowledge. Four hundred years before Galileo, when all Europe believed the earth to be a vast plain, Almamon asserted its sphericity, and determined its size from the admeasurement of a degree on its surface. Alhazen anticipated Newton by five hundred years in the discovery of many of the laws of light. It was the Moors who originated scientific chemistry and first applied it to medicine. They laid all Europe under obligation by their achievements in mechanics, horology, astronomy, botany, and zoology, and by their additions to the *materia medica* and the useful fruits and vegetables. They wrote their names forever in characters of light upon the midnight heavens in the names they gave the starry constellations, and left their impress on every language of Europe in the nomenclature of the chemical and other products they discovered. Many

French, German, and Italian ecclesiastics were educated at the Moorish Universities. One of these, Gerbert, afterward Pope Sylvester, introduced the Arabic numerals, the greatest instrument of science, originally derived from India, into Europe. The manufacture of gunpowder, the use of artillery, many of the nobler kinds of metallurgy, were also brought from the East and communicated to Europe by the Moors.

A great and permanent impetus was given to the civilization of the West by that vast movement of the Middle Ages, whereby, in the words of the Byzantine Princess, Anna Comnena, all Europe was precipitated on Asia. The Crusades have been so often treated in detail that we shall only notice a few of their more striking results. These religious wars united the nations of the West in a grand political league long before any similar union could otherwise have taken place. They also greatly improved, or, indeed, almost created, the military organization of Europe, and inspired and fostered the spirit of chivalry in her populations. They led to the abolition of serfdom by the substitution of martial service instead of the abject vassalage to which the masses had been accustomed. By enforcing the so-called Truce of God they prevented the pernicious practice of private warfare, and turned the arms of Christendom against its common foe. Vast multitudes were led to visit Italy, Constantinople, and the East—the seats of ancient learning, and the scenes of splendid opulence. Extended travel enlarged their knowledge of the geography, literature, natural history, and productions of foreign lands. In the East still lingered the remains of the science of the palmy days of the Caliphate. The rustic manners of the Crusaders became polished by their contact with the more refined oriental races. To the British or German knight, who had never stirred farther from his ancestral castle than a boar hunt or a stag chase led him, what a wonder-land must Italy and the East have been, with their great cities, their marble palaces, porphyry pillars, and jasper domes! The Crusaders, becoming acquainted with the luxuries of the Orient, discovered new wants, felt new desires, and brought home a knowledge of arts and elegances before unknown.

The result was seen in the greater splendor of the Western courts, in their more gorgeous pomp and ceremonial, and in

the more refined taste in pleasure, dress, and ornaments. The miracles and treasures of ancient art and architecture in Greece and Italy, far more numerous than now, did much to create and develop a taste for the beautiful, and to enlarge the sphere of human enjoyment. The refining influence of the East and South have left their mark in every corner of Europe, from Gibraltar to Norway, from Ireland to Hungary, from the crosses on the doors to the arabesque traceries in cathedrals and castles.

It is not wonderful that these great and stirring events, with their combined religious enthusiasm and military splendor, awoke the imagination of the poets. They gave a new impulse to thought, and a greater depth and strength to feeling. They inspired the muse of Tasso and many a lesser bard, and supplied the theme of the great Christian epic, *Gierusalemme Liberata*.

The Crusaders, moreover, made several commercial settlements in the East, the trade of which survived their military occupation by the Latins. Thus a valuable commerce sprang up, which contributed greatly to enrich the resources, ameliorate the manners, and increase the comforts of the West.

But there were grave and serious evils resulting from the Crusades, which went far to counterbalance all these advantages. The lives and labors of millions were lost to Europe, and buried beneath the sands of Syria. Many noble families became extinguished by the fortunes of war, or impoverished by the sale or mortgaging of their estates to furnish the means for military equipment. The influence of the Pope, as the organizer of the Crusades and common father of Christendom, was greatly augmented. The opulence and corruption of the religious orders was increased by the reversion to their possession of many estates whose heirs had perished in the field. Vast numbers of oriental relics, many of them spurious and absurd, became objects of idolatrous worship. Many corruptions of the Greek Church were imitated, many Syrian and Greek saints introduced into the calendar, and many Eastern legends and superstitions acquired currency.

Of most important bearing on the literary history of Europe was the fall of Constantinople, A. D. 1453. Terrific and protracted was the struggle for the key of Eastern empire and the

throne of the Eastern Cæsars. The toils of Fate at length encompassed the doomed city. The cup of her iniquity was full. The wrath of heaven, long invoked by her horrid abominations, at length burst in flame upon her head. The fierce and fiery Mohammed, like an avenging messenger of doom—an awful Nemesis—appeared before her walls. Never was more dreadful night than the eve of the final assault. The blaze of nocturnal fires illumined the entire extent of massy wall. The novel terror of the lightning flash and thunder stroke of the newly-invented cannon—terrific to the Greeks as the bolts of Jove—were added to the more familiar concussions of the battering-rams; while the mysterious and inextinguishable Greek fire heightened the horror of the scene. Above the din of conflict were heard the shouts of the terrible Janissaries—eager for the slaughter as hounds in leash—*Allah Akbar! Allah hu!* while within the doomed city arose, amid the darkness, from the sad procession of priests and warriors wending to the Church of St. Sophia, the wailing dirge, *Kyrie eleeson! Christe eleeson!*

All Europe was aghast with horror and dismay at the fall of the ancient seat of Greek empire. The Pope summoned the entire West, from Sweden to Naples, from Poland to Britain to drive the Turk from European soil. But spiritual anathemas and political leagues were alike despised by the victorious invader. He crossed to Italy, seized and sacked Otranto, and would probably have become master of old as well as of New Rome had he not been overtaken by Death, a conqueror as relentless as himself.

The Byzantine capital was the great treasure-house of ancient learning. There the Greek language—the language of Homer and the gods—was a living tongue. That tongue, corrupted by the populace, it is true, was spoken by the nobles with sufficient purity to enable them to delight in the sublime dreams of Plato, the dark tragedy of Æschylus, or the Christian eloquence of Chrysostom. The victorious army of the Turks compelled the flight of the Muses. A vast number of educated Greeks emigrated to Italy, and were dispersed throughout the entire West. The immense collection of MSS., statues, antiques, gems, vases, *intaglios*, and treasures of art and objects of luxury was scattered throughout Europe. Florence became a

haven for the exiled Greeks. Cosmo de Medicis and his illustrious descendant, Lorenzo il Magnifico, became the zealous patrons of the new learning. Thus the ancient literature, which withered and was forgotten under its native skies, revived and flourished in a western clime.

Simultaneously with the fall of Constantinople, the invention of a German mechanic gave wings to the new learning, where-with it might fly, as lightly as the thistle-down, to the ends of the earth. This wonderful art gave a permanent life to that ancient literature which was in such imminent danger of extinction, and, by the immense multiplication of copies, made it thenceforth indestructible. By this revival and diffusion of Greek learning, also, a mighty impetus was given to the great Reformation, which was soon to emancipate the minds of millions, and to stimulate the process of free inquiry wherever Protestantism should prevail.

Another very powerful Oriental influence exerted upon Europe was that of the Jewish race. That race, though everywhere proscribed and persecuted, every-where obtained a footing, and, by the advancement of science and commerce, repaid with benefits the injuries it received. Yet the tale of their persecution by fire and faggot, by rack and dungeon, is one of the darkest pages in European history. Pillaged and plundered, scattered and peeled, branded and mutilated, smitten by every hand and execrated by every lip, they seemed to bear, in all its bitterness of woe, the terrible curse invoked by their fathers, "His blood—the blood of the Innocent One—be upon us and on our children." Trampled and beaten to the earth, decimated and slaughtered, they have yet, like the trodden grass that ranker grows, increased and multiplied in spite of their opposition. Those "Ishmaels and Hagars of mankind," exiled from the home of their fathers, and harried from land to land, have verily eaten the unleavened bread and bitter herbs of bondage, and drunken the waters of Marah. In many foreign lands they have sat beside strange streams and wept as they remembered Zion.

"Anathema Maranatha! was the cry

That rang from town to town, from street to street;

At every gate the accursed Mordecai

Was mocked and jeered and spurned by Christian feet."

But that toleration which they found nowhere among the

disciples of the Galilean, they received from the followers of the False Prophet. They were advanced to the highest positions of trust and honor at the courts of the Saracen conquerors of Spain. They became the treasurers and confidential advisers of the Emirs. They were frequently the chancellors and professors of the Moorish universities. They were generally the favorite physicians of the rulers, an office not less influential than that of the confessors of the catholic sovereigns of Europe.

There was, indeed, a mutual bond of sympathy between the children of Ishmael and those of Isaac. Besides their common descent from the Father of the faithful, and their kindred languages, customs, and traditions, their similar creeds concerning the unity of the Godhead, and their aversion to the Trinitarian theology of the Christians, drew them more closely together. In Alexandria the Jews had acquired all the learning of the East. Indeed, it was from them and the Nestorians, doubtless, that the Saracens acquired those germs of science and philosophy which they afterward developed to such munificent results, alike on the banks of the Euphrates and of the Guadalquivir. Thus a mighty but intangible influence accompanied their invasion of Europe that the iron hammer of Charles Martel could not beat back. Great numbers of Jews came to Spain with the Saracens. They became the first and, for a long time, almost the only physicians of Europe. They enriched the *materia medica* with discoveries of chemistry, in which they were expert. The healing art was previously obscured and debased by magic, sorcery, and empiricism. These hags of darkness, to use the figure of Professor Draper, vanished at the crowing of the Æsculapian cock, announcing that the intellectual dawn of Europe had arrived. The system of supernaturalism, which universally obtained, was first assailed by the practical science of the Jews. Their rationalistic diagnosis relieved disease of its spiritual terrors, and sapped the foundation of superstition in Europe, as Christian science is at present doing in India. This, and their great wealth, made them the frequent victims of the Inquisition. Notwithstanding, some of them became the private physicians even of the Popes who persecuted their race. They taught in the Rabbinical schools of Italy, Sicily, and France, as well as in Spain. Persecution and travel sharpened their naturally acute intellects, so that

they early got control of the greater part of the commerce of Europe. It has been truly said, They were our factors and bankers before we knew how to read. The Spanish religious wars drove many from that country and dispersed them through Europe, to which they gave an intellectual impulse which it feels to this day.

Jewish influence also contributed to mediæval thought a tinge of Oriental mysticism. The turbid stream of cabalistic philosophy intoxicated some of the noblest minds of Europe. The wild and fantastic theories of Paracelsus and the Rosicrucians, of Cornelius Agrippa and Jacob Behmen, concerning the various orders of elementary spirits, emanations from the deity—a mixture of fanaticism and imposture—were also founded upon the reveries of the cabala. That theophanic system, in its turn, was linked with the venerable Oriental lore of ancient sages on the banks of the Ganges and the Oxus.

The influence of Hebrew thought and of the Eastern imagery and language of the Sacred Scriptures upon the Christian system of theology opens up a vast and varied field of investigation which we must leave to some abler pen than ours. It might be found that many of our common and controlling thoughts have their roots far back in remote Oriental antiquity. Assuredly it would appear that the Syrian faith, which began first to be preached at Jerusalem, has been more potent in its influence on the heart and mind of Christendom than all the lore of Greece or Rome, or than all the combined wisdom of the Orient and Occident besides. It has been the great seminal principle from which has sprung all that is best in all the literatures and philosophies, in all the systems of ethics and jurisprudence, in all the political and social economies of the world since its promulgation. It has ennobled, dignified, and elevated them all. It is the hope, and the only hope, for the regeneration of the race.

Much might be said, had we space, upon the influence of the commerce of the East—the land of pearl and gold, of spices and perfumes, of frankincense and myrrh—on the civilization of Europe. The maritime States of the Mediterranean became especially enriched thereby. The names of their merchant princes became familiar as household words in the bazars of Damascus and Ispahan. Their daughters were clothed with

the silks of Iran and the shawls of Cashmere; and in their *boudoirs* hung, in gilded cages, the tuneful bulbul from the gardens of Schiraz. In the effort to prosecute this gainful commerce by a shorter route a new world was discovered, where the problem of humanity is now being wrought out to such glorious results. The wealth of Ormuz and of Ind was poured into the lap of Europe. Her comforts and luxuries were increased, her manners refined, her enterprise quickened, and a field of empire opened to her arms.

The present decrepitude of the Ottoman Empire can give no idea of its strength in the fiery zeal of its youth, nor of the apprehensions which it caused throughout the West. A new crusade was then waged, not to wrest the Holy Sepulcher from the power of the Turks, but to prevent the subversion of the Christian faith in its very strongholds. Their corsair fleets swept the Mediterranean, and the terrible Janissaries were the scourge of Central Europe.

For two hundred years the tide of battle ebbed and flowed across the great Sarmatian plain, between Vienna and Belgrade; and Germany became in the sixteenth century, as Spain had been in the eighth, the bulwark of Christendom.

It is strange that the power which was long the standing menace of other nations of Europe should now exist only by the sufferance or jealousy of those very nations. Yet feeble and decrepit as is Turkey, no country excites such regard. The interest thickens around the "sick man's" couch. He holds the key of empire in his trembling grasp. Into whose hands shall it pass when it falls from his? This is *the* question of the day—the Gordian knot, whose intricacy, indissoluble by any diplomatic skill, may, possibly, yield only to the keen edge of the sword.

In the East itself, under Ottoman rule, a blight seems to rest upon the fairest and most favored lands on earth. The glory of the Seven Churches of Asia has departed; the candlesticks are removed out of their places, and thick darkness has settled upon the land. The beautiful myths of Homer and the sublime Gospel of Christ are alike forgotten, and the Turkish mosque has superseded both Pagan fane and Christian temple. As we contemplate these things we cannot help asking, Is it forever? Is there no resurrection for those

nations? no regeneration for those lands? Yet, though oppression and superstition may have crushed and degraded the inhabitants, nature is eternal, and the golden sunlight falls, and the sapphire seas expand, and the purple mountains rise as fair and lovely as of yore. The valleys of the Orontes and Jordan and the slopes of Lebanon are no less beautiful, nor is the soil of Egypt less fertile to-day than in the time of their greatest prosperity and glory.

The Christian nations of the West are called upon by every principle of moral obligation and of human sympathy to reciprocate the benefits they originally received from the East. It is theirs to carry to those dark lands the light of the Gospel, and the blessings of letters and civilization. Indications of the progress of Western ideas are already numerous and striking. The iron horse snorts in the valley of the Nile, and the iron steamer plies upon its sacred waters. The recent visit of the Sultan and his Viceroy to the seats of western civilization must have impressed them with the contrast between its vigor and prosperity, and the effete and worn-out condition of society in their own dominions. May we not hope that they will be convinced of the superiority of Christian institutions and of monogamic marriage to the superstitions of the mufti and the debasing sensuality of the seraglio? The recent Abyssinian expedition has carried the prestige of European arms and science, and will probably open a way for the Gospel into the very heart of Africa; and the opening of the Suez Canal makes Egypt the high-way of the Western nations to the East. Christian schools and Christian missions are sowing throughout the entire East the seeds of new and nobler civilization. The crescent may ere long give place to the banner of the cross upon the battlements of Zion, the long-rejected Messiah be adored amid the scenes of his passion, and Jerusalem become again a praise in the earth.

The drowsy nations of the remoter East are turning in their troubled sleep. They are arousing themselves from the lethargy of centuries, and are shaking from them the incubus which so long has oppressed them—their fatuous scorn and hatred of the western barbarians. They are waking up to the activities of the age. They feel the pulses of a new life throbbing and thrilling through all the veins and arteries of

society. The light of science and of the Gospel is dispelling the clouds of ignorance, superstition, and prejudice that so long have mantled over those lands. The night of ages is giving way, and its darkness is being dispersed. A brighter day is bursting on the East. Its freshness breathes around us now. The heralds of the dawn may every-where be seen. Old and hoary symptoms of idolatry and priestcraft are crumbling away. Cruel and bloody heathen rites are being exterminated. A vigorous journalism—that great disseminator of the seeds of thought—is springing up in all the great marts of commerce both in India and China. The absurd myths of the gods, and the religious cosmogonies, are yielding to scientific criticism. The sacred Ganges and the Hoogly swarm with vessels impelled by a more potent genius than any of the Arabian Nights—the great western magician—Steam. China is constructing a steam navy. Yokohama is being lighted with gas. British and American commerce are extending the sphere of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, and diffusing liberal ideas. Chinese emigrants are swarming to Australia and the Pacific coast of America, and insensibly imbibing much of the western spirit and enterprise. The Pacific Railway conducts the tide of oriental commerce to the very heart of occidental civilization; and the projected Pacific Telegraph Cable will knit together East and West in indissoluble bonds of “peace and good-will.”

The glorious trophies of the progress of civilization are the auguries of still grander triumphs in the future. Those already mentioned are of very recent achievement. What sublime results may not some who read this brief retrospect behold! Those blind and impotent old lands, which so long have struggled with the demons of superstition and idolatry, shall eventually sit, clothed and in their right mind, at the feet of Jesus. The day is hastening when, in a world saved, regenerated, disenthralled from the power and dominion of sin, the Redeemer shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; when he shall receive the heathen for his inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; when upon all the industries and activities of the world—upon all its trade and commerce, its art, its science, and its literature—shall be written, HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

And to this blessed consummation all the events of history,

the rise and progress of nations, the decay and fall of dynasties, are tending. With devout as well as philosophic eye, let us read the history of the world, and endeavor to discern, amid its confused revolutions, its battle and its tumults, the great moving principle—the wheel within the wheel—God by his providence reconciling the world unto himself. Let us ever feel that

"God's greatness flows around our incompleteness,
Round our restlessness his rest."

ART. V.—THE ETHICS OF LATIN COMEDY.

It is doubtful whether the moral notions of a people are best represented in the ethical systems of her philosophers. These systems are not constructed on the basis of popular sentiment. They may embody that sentiment in part, but they are often only the speculations of a profound thinker whose theories and ideas are not always even the metaphysics of practical morality. Doubtless the current of popular ideas will mingle more or less in the flood of philosophical thought, and give it more or less coloring; but the little streams will disappear in the larger flood. The ethical sentiment of the masses, that which governs their every-day life, is fused into new and unrecognizable forms in the crucible of the philosopher. The public morals of our own age are not so well mirrored in the ethical treatises and text-books, the essays and homilies and theological dogmatics of our thinkers and professional teachers, as in the lighter literature of the day and the regular issues of the periodical press. A poet from the people, a novelist from the masses, steeped in the ideas and manners of the nation at large, is the best portrayer of actual morality. Burns unveils the Scottish heart better than Chalmers. Shakspeare and Dickens and Scott utter the real practical moral sentiment of England better than Barrow or Hall. Victor Hugo illustrates the popular ethics of France better than Guizot. The more closely literature photographs real life the nearer is our view of the genuine heart-beats, where actual conduct is the exponent of controlling ethical principles. The best index of a man's faith is his life. The ribs and frame-work of a nation's faith reveal themselves most distinctly when the

toga of philosophy with its deceptive folds is taken off, and only the working tunic with its close-fitting honesty remains.

The same law is true for all time. A day of actual observation in the Rome of the Christian era would tell more of her moral state than the whole history of her gods. To stand for an hour in the forum, to lounge at evening on the thoroughfares of business, to watch the comers and goers of the *thermæ* in the waiting rooms of those splendid structures, to sit amid the throngs of the amphitheaters, to listen to the conversation in the atria of the dwellings and in the shops of the artisans, to mingle, in a word, with the current of that surging Roman life, would daguerreotype at a glance more than the philosophic pencil could paint in a life-time. It is upon similar principles that Aristophanes is a better representative of Athenian morals than Plato; that Plautus teaches popular ethics better than Cicero.

Comedy is a style of literature admirably adapted to develop the real state of public morals. It is not embarrassed by the necessity of conforming to an ethical system. This requires an unfolding of all its details in harmony with a basis that may be partly ideal, partly in advance of general practice or at variance with it. Comedy is not thus trammelled. It affords a fair field where the spontaneous heart of the people may appear. It is from the people and for the people. If its characters are true to life, they must speak the colloquial language and utter the current sentiment of the people. They will enunciate its maxims, adages, and proverbs, which are the best index of a nation's moral consciousness because they are the practical rules of common life. They are the decalogue of its law and the beatitudes of its gospel.

Comedy is a fine setting for ethics. Its groundwork does not lie in the moral faculties. Its legitimate purpose is as far from moral teaching as laughter is from tears. Its moral sentiments, therefore, sparkle like stars through the cloud-rifts. They are the sudden uncovering of the heart and conscience, the faith and the religious nature, in the midst of the general sweep of mirth and hilarity. They are the big boulders in the roaring torrent, that tell of solidity at the bottom.

To Plautus, Terence, and Cæcilius we must look for these practical illustrations of religion and piety among the ancient

Romans. Scattered through their works there is ample material for constructing their systems of ethics and theology. I shall give only a few specimens, chiefly from Plautus, showing the prevailing notions of the age. Fundamental in their practical conduct would be their ideas of the Deity and his attributes. What these ideas were may be seen from two or three quotations:

There is a God, and he whate'er we do
Sees with omniscient eye and hears it too.
As thou for me, so he for him will care;
The well-deserving good, the evil ill must share.

Capt., Act II, sc. 2, lines 313-316.

Throughout the nations, each his errand given,
Great Jove, who governs earth and highest heaven,
Dispatches us, his ministers, to know
The deeds of men: what piety they show,
What character they bear, what faith they keep;
That each due meed of actions here may reap.
Who by false witness gets unlawful gain,
By wicked oath another's dues retain,
Their evil names and crimes of deepest dye
Are borne by us and registered on high.
Who by base perjury obtain their cause,
Or bribe the judge to override the laws,
His righteous judgment doth the case reverse,
And plague the guilty with the heavier curse.
The good on separate tablets are enrolled,
Their honored names in characters of gold.
And yet bad men imagine in their thought
With gifts and blood Heaven's favor can be bought,
Nor know that while they pray at heavy cost,
Their gifts and sacrifice are labor lost.
The pious suppliant sooner far will find
Grace from above than he of evil mind,
Be glad, ye good, and in your works rejoice,
Who faith and piety have made your choice.

RUDENS, *Prol.* 9-30.

These extracts contain as excellent religious sentiments as are to be found in classical literature. They recognize a Supreme Being, and the infinite attributes of power, knowledge, and justice that belong to him. The eternal principles on which the Divine Being metes out rewards and punishments according to the different characters of men are correctly stated and commended. Whence came their ideas of a *record* of human transactions? Can they be traced through the traditions of centuries back to the Old Testament Scriptures? Had their

ancestors long ages before heard the voice of God and echoed it thus distinctly down to them? Had they ever heard the words of the Psalmist, "Shall they escape by iniquity? Put thou my tears into thy bottle: are they not written in thy book?" Had they read, "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me?" Had they heard of Solomon's grand basis of judgment, "whether it be good or whether it be evil?" If the idea of a future judgment was not contemplated, for what purpose was this registering of good and bad deeds? How closely the sentiment of these passages agrees with the voice of inspiration in regard to the true principles of worship is most strikingly shown by a comparison with verses tenth to thirtieth of the first chapter of Isaiah.

As a parallel to these quotations from Plautus it will be of interest to read the celebrated passage from Menander, of which it has been remarked that it contains almost all the precepts in the second table of the Decalogue:

The man who sacrifices, Pamphilus,
A multitude of bulls, or goats, or sheep,
Or prepares golden vestments, purple raiment,
Figures of ivory, or precious gems,
Thinking to render God propitious to him,
Most grossly errs, and bears an empty mind.
Let him be good and charitable rather;
No doer of uncleanness, no corrupter
Of virgin innocence, no murderer, robber
In quest of gain. Covet not, Pamphilus,
Even a needleful of thread; for God,
Who's always near thee, always sees thy deeds.—COLMAN.

With such a recognition of spiritual attributes in the Divine Being as these passages afford, it seems hardly possible that the foundation of ethical consciousness in the soul of Plautus and Menander, and those whom they represent, is an impersonal natural or an embodied material being. The eye that reads the secrets of all hearts, the presence that environs every human being, and the power that controls all human conduct and worldly events, must belong to an infinite Spiritual Being. The lack of formal and systematic statements is no deviation from the method of all the earliest writers whether inspired or un-inspired. The clear recognition of truth in writings where the establishment of that truth is not aimed at, as in axioms, proverbs, poetry and history, is free from all suspicion of

logical sophistry and all the doubtfulness of counterfeit philosophy.

It is the virgin gold of the sands, with no touch of artificial gilding. One cannot read such language without feelings of moral sympathy. It is the spiritual pulse of humanity that throbs through the ages. It is not that conviction is produced, but conviction is already there, and the slumbering elements of the Divine within us feel and bear it on as the magnetic reservoirs of earth receive and transmit any exciting influence. The quickness of the response indicates that, however buried in the rubbish of ignorance or false education, the soul leaps to hear the voice of the Infinite Father whenever he speaks.

This longing of the heart after the Divine Being, as the proper foundation of religious life, is laid hold of by Paul in his discourse on Mars Hill. His assertion and quotation from Aratus, the Cilician poet, "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring," has its counterpart in the prayer of Hanno in the *Pœnulus* of Plautus.

O thou who man dost nourish and defend,
By whom we live, on whom our hopes depend,
Make this day fortunate for my design;
My children lost, for whom long years I pine,
Restore to liberty, that I may see
Unconquered piety is blessed of thee.

Pœnulus, Act IV, sec. 4, lines 14-17.

The clearest acknowledgment is given in these lines of man's indebtedness to the Deity for existence, support and success, and an unwavering confidence that the rewards of virtue, though long delayed, are sure. Through them we may see, as Paul saw of the Greeks, Him whom the Romans of the Plautinian age ignorantly worshiped. They breathe the same inward yearning of the soul after the true and living God which Paul interprets as really meant for him in the ignorant and blind worship they offered, and which he endeavors to guide by the faint light that reveals the higher world to a profounder knowledge.

God has not left himself without a witness. As he has written some of his attributes upon the material world, so he has written others upon the human heart. To the natural sense, physical law is evident by experience and observation. To the moral sense, moral law and the fundamental facts of

moral relationship and duties are evident, not by the slow processes of reasoning and inference, but by the constitution of the moral nature. In prehistoric and prephilosophic ages morality was a practical art, and not a speculative science. Even the Old Testament writers are not philosophers. They enter into no discussion, inquiry, nor speculative dispute. They appeal simply to memory, conscience, and sentiment for facts, precepts, and motive. The uninspired authors of the same age, while they give all the essential principles of virtue and the motives to its practice, give us no regular treatises on morals. They simply give the voice of conscience with no sophistry to stifle it. The gods of Homer and Hesiod are no creations of a philosophic brain, but they are the gods whom the people worshiped. The poets simply recognized them as they found them. The notions that the laws of justice had divine authority, that there was a future life in which virtue was rewarded and vice punished, that there is a Providence that interests itself in the affairs of men, and that men are responsible to God, were universally prevalent. On these principles, needing no more demonstration than the axioms of mathematics, but taken for granted as known and admitted by every body, each individual, with the simplicity and certainty of intuition, felt rather than inferred certain other consequences, and constructed all the practical rules of life. Realizing no need to prove the existence of God, they said he was to be revered and worshiped. It was not necessary to establish his authority and rights, but it was necessary to obey him. They made no inquiry into the nature of conscience, but they heeded its dictates. They needed no discussion in regard to justice and injustice in order to save them from confounding them. Not disputing the question of the soul's immortality or immateriality, of a future state, or of the nature of rewards and punishments, they feared a Being who abhors wickedness, and practiced virtue in expectation of his blessing.

The gleams of these fundamental truths that flash out in the ancient poets, and especially in comedy, are refreshing, not only as the revelation of God, written upon the fleshly tablets of the heart, but as a relief to the general mass of corruption both in literature and in the society it portrays. They are the flowers upon the sepulcher. Amid the seething volcanic fires that

raged in the social life of heathendom, they tell of a restless moral Enceladus whose uneasy rebellion at his confinement fitly symbolizes the conscientious remonstrances with which God shakes men, though they heap crime upon crime to mountain proportions. God never takes the sting from conscience. The testimony to its power is no uncommon sentiment in the ancient writers. Cicero often alludes to it. Ovid thus recognizes it :

Clean innocence in woe much comfort hath ;
As is the conscience, so the mind doth breed,
Or hope or fear, for every acted deed.—MASSEY.

OVID, *Fast.*, Lib. I, ver. 481.

So Horace, Lib. I, Epist. I, ver. 60 :

Be this thy brazen bulwark of defense,
Still to preserve thy conscious innocence,
Nor e'er turn pale with guilt.—FRANCIS.

In the *Mostelleria* of Plautus, Tranio utters the same sentiment :

Nothing so wretched to the writhing heart
As guilty conscience with its venom'd dart.

Most., Act III, ver. 12.

Some miscellaneous quotations will indicate in various social and civil relations the correctness of moral sentiment which the Romans entertained, and its striking similarity in many instances to that of Scripture. Philto, in the *Trinummus*, Act II, sc. 2, line 28, speaks thus :

If passion rule the man he is undone ;
Self-hood is lost, and servitude begun ;
But whoso his own spirit ruleth, fame
Victor of victors justly shall proclaim.

One would almost accuse him of plagiarism on the proverb of the wisest of men : "He that ruleth his own spirit is better than he that taketh a city." How accurately is Paul's doctrine of unselfishness and humility echoed in these lines :

That man is upright who does not repent
His uprightness, and secretly lament,
Who pleases self does not deserve to wear
So high a title, nor its honors bear ;
Who thinks but meanly of himself doth show
The nature only noble souls can know.

Trin., Act II, sc. 2, line 40.

What could be more in harmony with the first commandment with promise than the filial reverence of Lysiteles ?

My father ! upward from my earliest youth
Thy precepts have I kept with filial truth ;
Though noble born and free I bow my will,
And deem it just thy wishes to fulfill.

The Psalmist says of the good man, "With long life will I satisfy him;" and of deceitful men, they "shall not live out half their days." Young Pleusicles echoes it, *Miles Glor.*, Act III, sc. 1, line 135, thus :

Justly the gods apportion human life ;
Who nobly bear them in this earthly strife
Long years they give ; but reprobate
And wicked men quick leave their mortal state.

Alemena's catalogue of the virtues which a moral wife should possess, and which she claims for herself, if universally practiced might improve even a Christian society in these days of divorce and murder :

Not mine the dower which sordid souls require ;
But womanly reserve, subdued desire,
Untarnished honor, reverential fear
Of God, and love for friends and kindred dear :
To you obedience, gifts to all the good,
And help to those who have in virtue stood.

Amph., Act II, sc. 2, line 210.

In connection with this passage, the soliloquy of Adelphasium in the *Pœn.*, I, 2, 1, indicates that the peculiar weakness of the sex is not wholly a modern development :

Who wants employment, all his hands can do,
A woman and a ship procure—these two :
For no two things more business can entail
When you begin to rig them to set sail.
Ne'er enough rigged are these to suit their taste :
Insatiate two ! reckless of loss and waste.

The gross corruption of social life, so fearfully pictured in inspired and uninspired history, was not without those who condemned it and warned man against it. There was a spirit of conservatism, and a longing for the more ancient virtues. The social surface was a boiling Acheron, from which ever and anon a wail of lamentation and of warning came forth. Thus Philto's advice to his son :

I know the wicked manners of our times,
How evil men the good seduce to crimes ;
How greed and lust turns sacred to profane,
And public interest yields to private gain.

Disorder reigns! men thirst for fame and power,
 And gape for gain as earth for cooling shower,
 For this I weep; this breeds tormenting care;
 Of this, I urge thee day and night, beware.

Trin., II, 2, 8.

Could a history of morals among all nations and in all ages be written, it would constantly reveal a broad gulf between theoretical and practical virtue. No matter whether the foundations of virtue be in the religion of nature, in the philosophical systems of classical antiquity, or in the Christianity of the Bible, the same inconsistencies between sentiment and action would be found. Every-where the heart preaches virtue and the hand practices vice. To this universal law the morality of pre-philosophical and mythological eras furnishes no exception. Had the ethical theories as to the true basis of a prosperous civil government, branded upon the popular conscience as they were, been embodied in the popular conduct, imperial Rome would never have existed nor republican Rome been conquered.

Be but the manners of the people good,
 The city's fortified with noble blood;
 If breach of faith be banished from her walls,
 If public money heed no private calls,
 If avarice, scandal, perjury and spite,
 Ambition, idleness, the lawless might
 Of lust, injustice: these be driven hence,
 The thickest wall is not so sure defense.

Persa., IV, 4, 10.

What other morality is necessary to the perpetuity of a state? Had it been incarnate in the Roman people, the historian of the "Decline and Fall" would have been without a subject.

Some promiscuous sentiments and proverbs, selected from the multitude, that contain ethical elements, will be of interest as showing the current of opinion that prevailed, as well as some correspondences between the past and the present:

He dies to live who dies in virtue's cause.—*Capt.*, III, 5, 33.

'Tis in the nature of unhappy men

To envy good and give their betters pain.—*Capt.*, III, 4, 50.

This is the modern adage, "Misery loves company."

A favor done to the good is pregnant with good.—*Capt.*, II, 2, 108.

An evil known is best; an ill unknown

Puzzles all knowledge what had best be done.—*Trin.*, I, 2, 25.

A wise man makes his fortune for himself.—*Trin.* II, 2, 84.

In every thing the golden mean is best.—*Pen.* I, 2, 98.

"I wish you well" is but a hollow term,

Save of good services it form the germ.—*Trin.* II, 4, 38.

That you conceal it from your wife, be sure;

To keep a secret she cannot endure.—*Trin.* III, 3, 70.

Wisdom is gained by effort, not by age.—*Trin.* II, 2, 88.

'Tis best to be the best in every aim;

Below the second best ne'er rest thy claim.—*Trin.* II, 4, 86.

The man who does not know his way to sea,

'Tis fit the river his companion be.—*Pen.* III, 3, 15.

Old age is a sad peddler, on his back

Bearing along of grievances a pack.—*Moen.* IV, 5, 5.

The hammer is no wiser than the handle.—*Epid.* III, 4, 100.

He's a friend indeed

Who proves himself a real friend in need.—*Epid.* I, 2, 15.

If a woman's handsome she is dressed enough.—*Most.* I, 3, 180.

'Tis not easy

To blow and swallow at the selfsame time.—*Most.* III, 2, 103.

Never speak ill of absent friend!—*Trin.* IV, 2, 82.

The bell never tinkles of itself.—*Trin.* IV, 2, 160.

As servants choose to have their master be,

Good to the good, bad to the bad is he.—*Most.* IV, 1, 14.

Bad men are so because they hate the good;

One must himself be good the good to love.—*Pseu.* I, 1, 16.

O a good temper's half in half in evils.—*Pseu.* I, 5, 38.

Count it as lost whate'er you loan a friend;

If sought again, he's hostile in the end.

With this compare the sentiment of Shakspeare in *Hamlet*,
Act I, sc. 6:

"Neither a borrower nor a lender be,
For loan oft loseth both itself and friend."

The common saying, "Blessings brighten as they take their flight," may have originated in the mournful lament of Ergasilus for his patron:

When men once lose the good that they possess,
They prize what erst they held as valueless.—*Capt.* I, 2, 40.

And Shakspeare may have read it and put it into the friar's mouth when he said:

For so it falls out
That what we have we prize not to the worth
Whilst we enjoy it: but being lacked and lost,

Why then we rack the value ; then we find
 The virtue that possession would not show us
 Whilst it was ours.—*Much Ado about Nothing*, Act IV, sc. 2.

So, also, Shakspeare's oft-quoted "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just," is paralleled in Alcmena's indignant remonstrance to Amphitrus :

Bold may she be who's free from all offense
 To plead her cause with mailèd confidence.—*Amph.*, II, 2, 206.
 The soul of honor in an honest breast
 Is to remember duty's high behest.—*Trin.*, III, 2, 70.
 'Tis worthy of the gods to have respect
 Unto the poor.—*Trin.*, IV, 1, 10.
 Oft what we have in hand and plain to view
 We count as lost, and seek, and seek anew.—*Trin.*, IV, 2, 69.
 Sorrow keeps close behind pleasure.—*Amph.*, II, 2, 5.
 Patience is the best sauce for sorrow.—*Rud.*, II, 3, 72.

"*Tunica proprior palliost*," "My coat is nearer to me than my cloak ;" "*At nemo solus satis sapit*," "Two heads are better than one"—these are sentiments which find some proverbial mold among all nations.

With one other passage showing the common ideas and feelings of humanity we close these quotations :

Him we call wise whose counsel hath success,
 And him a fool whom fortune fails to bless.
 Ourselves are fools when what we wish to have
 Importunate the boon we willful crave:
 As if 'twere possible for us to know
 What will turn out to our advantage. So
 We lose the certain and the uncertain keep
 In toil and pain till death upon us creep.—*Pseud.*, II, 3, 15.

When the noble sentiment of Terence, "*Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto*," was first uttered on the Roman stage, it was received by the whole audience with a burst of applause. Through the harness joints of their corrupt armor it pierced to their moral vitality. Below Roman sensuality and selfishness, below the black lava-tide of corruption that covered the Eternal City more terribly than the fires of Vesuvius had burned Pompeii and Herculaneum, slumbered still the life of God in the human soul, imprisoned and crushed, but responsive to truth and virtue, and ever asserting itself.

ART. VI.—WUTTKE ON GREEK ETHICS IN THEIR
GOLDEN AGE.

TRANSLATED BY PROFESSOR J. P. LACROIX.

It was in the Golden Age of Attic philosophy, and especially in the efforts of PLATO and ARISTOTLE, that Gentile thought put forth its proudest efforts by wisdom to find out God. The views of these two thinkers deserve, therefore, special study.

PLATO: GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

Plato gives to Greek ethics a broad basis and scientific form. The world is an objective expression of divine ideas—a thing of beauty. Whatever corresponds to the divine idea, whatever is Godlike, is good. Man's final cause is, by virtue of his rational spirituality, consciously and freely to realize the good. The essence of virtue is delight in the good as being truly beautiful; that is, it is love. Virtue, as being in itself harmony of soul, is also the condition of true happiness. It is not, however, the mere sensation of pleasure, but rational knowledge that is the criterion of the good. Virtue, therefore, is neither indifferent to pleasure, nor consists in it, but produces it. Nevertheless all virtue, because of the imperfection essentially clinging to actual existence, remains ever incomplete in the earthly life; the corporeal state itself of man is a hinderance to the truly good.

Virtue is essentially an indivisible whole, but because of its relation to manifold spiritual faculties and activities it presents itself under the four forms of wisdom, manliness, temperance, and justice; of which the first is fundamental and controls the others.

Morality, however, is not an isolated quality of the individual; it is fully realized only in the moral community, the State; and the State, instead of being based on the family and on moral association, is rather itself the all-inclusive form of moral sociality. It produces out of itself and dominates with unlimited authority both the family and all other social bonds. The absolutism of the State swallows up into itself every right of the individual and of the family; and it is not as man, or as a member of the family, but only as citizen, that the individual

is capable of true morality. But it is only a small minority who are capable of citizenship; and this gifted few are, by the very fact of their capability, called to the unlimited guidance of the majority. The moral calling is, therefore, not for man in general, nor is it for all the same, nor is it in its full scope possible for all.

BASIS AND NATURE OF VIRTUE.

Plato far surpassed Socrates in spiritual insight. His creative genius developed the thoughts which his master had seen but in the distance into profound theories widely differing from the popular moralizing of Socrates. His unsystematized ethical thoughts lie profusely strewn through his works, Protagoras, Laches, Charmides, Euthyphron, Gorgias, Menon, Philebus, Politicus, and especially in the work wherein he shows the practical application of his ethical views, The State.

In taking a deeper hold than had yet been done on the thought of the rational spirit, Plato gains a much firmer basis for the ethical than any previous philosopher. The world, though not created, is yet molded by God, the absolute rational spirit, and is the truest possible expression of his thoughts, a copy of the divine eternal ideas. The realization of an idea is the beautiful; the *cosmos* is therefore a thing of beauty. The rational undying spirit of man is called to realize the beautiful, the ideal; and the highest goal of human life is ideality, that is, it is to become like God. This Godlikeness, consisting in justness and intelligent piety, is the good, and the highest good is God himself. But Plato does not further develop this thought of Godlikeness, and, indeed, he could not, as the idea itself of God, from his heathen stand-point, was too indefinite. The idea of good is not derived from the idea of God, but contrarily the idea of God from the idea of the good, as being fundamental and *per se* certain. The Platonic and the Christian idea of Godlikeness are widely different. In the place of the notion of a divine command we have that of the idea of the good, innate in the reason itself. This is the only conceivable revelation of the divine will. The good, which is conceived rather indefinitely as the inner harmony and order, or beauty, of the soul, that is, as the completed domination of the reason over the lower appetites—a formal rather than a

material definition—is *per se* divine and real, and as such is to be sought after. Virtue of itself renders truly happy, that is, produces inner soul-harmony; and there is no happiness without virtue, for virtue itself is harmony, or beauty, of soul. To do wrong is the greatest of all evils, greater than to suffer wrong. But happiness is not identical with every transitory feeling of pleasure. Such a feeling, being dependent on outward circumstances and mental moods, cannot, like the idea of the good, be unconditionally known, hence it cannot be a criterion of the good, nor can the good be sought after merely because of its pleasure.

The knowledge of the idea of *the good* being, like the consciousness of any other idea, not a product of reflective thought but an immediate possession of the reason, and the highest form of knowledge, is the basis and condition of virtue. Virtue is not a natural quality of man, but must be learned, and by learning be appropriated. The knowledge of the good leads necessarily to the cultivation of what is recognized as good. Evil springs essentially from error, and is never consciously and designedly committed. In this, Plato is perfectly in harmony with Socrates. The will has no independence in the face of knowledge, but is merely its necessary expression. The sensual desires, it is true, can oppose reason, but the spiritual will cannot. But that the heart, the spiritual essence itself of man, can have a natural propension to evil, Plato has no conception. And yet we find in him an obscure consciousness of the disorder of the actual world in the fact that he regards the present imprisonment of the soul in a body not as its original and natural condition but as a penal state. In fact, according to Plato, the soul existed as a rational personality in a previous bodiless state, and was imprisoned in a trammeling body only because of a moral transgression, so that now it is, as it were, fettered in a dark cell or cave. Also for another reason, though the good is the highest goal, yet is it never fully attainable in the earthly life. For as the actual world is not exclusively the work of the absolute Divine will, but is a product of two factors, of which the one is the primitive, unreal, (*μη ὄν*.) formless matter, and the other the ideal Divine will, and as this undivine matter does not perfectly yield to the will of God in stamping his ideas upon it, even as wax does not perfectly reproduce all the fine feat-

nres of a seal, so is the world not absolutely perfect, but only the best possible one. It is not the pure expression of the rational spirit, but there clings to it a never-to-be-overcome substratum of irrationality: an evil lying in the essence itself of the world, which, while not originating in the transgression of moral beings, is yet the ground-spring of all moral evil—an original sin. So, also, there is in man himself an original and never, in this life, entirely-overcomable disagreement between reason and the lower animal appetites, which should, in fact, be controlled by reason. Hence, with Plato, the moral consciousness lacks that hopeful confidence which characterizes it in the Christian system. "Evil can never be overcome, for there must ever be something opposed to the good; it cannot have hold among the gods, but dwells in mortal nature; hence, man must strive as speedily as possible to flee hence." "True philosophers desire to strive after nothing else than to die and be departed; for so long as we have the body, and our soul is joined to this evil, we cannot attain that wherewith we long." And they refrain from laying upon themselves suicidal hands only because God has placed them in this life as upon a watch which should not be rashly abandoned.

Morality consists, therefore, principally in man's turning himself *to* the ideal or spiritual, and *from* the merely sensuous. But this is only the ideal side of morality; the other is the real. As God, impressing his ideas upon matter, shaped the world into an object of beauty, so must also man actively work on nature, transforming it into beauty. Virtuousness is, consequently, active pleasure in the beautiful, which itself is harmony, not merely physical but also spiritual. The essence of virtue, or this pleasure in the beautiful, is love, *eros*, a thought fondly dwelt upon by Plato. But this love is widely different from Christian love, whereby man in communion with God feels himself in spiritual union with his fellow; but it is a love for the appearance, for the beautiful. Not the divine *per se* is loved, but only its concrete and essentially sensuous manifestation. It is not a love of soul for soul, but one that clings to the sensuous form. Hence, in Plato's State, it has no significance for the family. It is true, *eros* rises from the sensuous to the spiritual, to soul-beauty; but the sensuous remains the *basis*, and does not derive its worth from the spiritual. The beautiful

under all its forms is *per se* a relation of the Divine; is, in fact, the only phase of the Divine which we know. This is the characteristically Greek stand-point: beauty and grace cover every sin; even the frivolous is recognized as good, provided only it is beautiful. The approval of love under *every* form, even that of unnatural lust, is so familiar to the Greek that, to the shame of Greek morality, even Plato seeks philosophically to justify it. The predominant trait of love here is not self-denial, as with the Christian, but rather pleasure. I love another not for his sake but for mine. Love knows no sacrificing suffering, but only a rejoicing; at most a suffering of longing or jealousy. It is true, a merely sensual, fleshly love is censured; but wherever there is a higher love, not simply for the body but also for the soul, and where the Divine is recognized in the beautiful, there sensual love, even under the form of a defilement of its own sex, finds its justification and becomes a virtue, nay, a religious enthusiasm. "Esthetically done it is beautiful, but otherwise shameful." The simple circumstance that Plato speaks so often, so lengthily, and with such manifest fondness of this absolutely vicious love, (Rom. i, 27,) while he hardly mentions mere sexual love, and in his extended discourses on *eros*, says not one word of conjugal love, and yet attempts by the strangest sophistry and enthusiastic poetizing to drive away a lingering suspicion that this unnatural vice is, after all, infamous, is an astonishing evidence of the moral darkness of the Greek mind.

THE FOUR PLATONIC VIRTUES.

Plato's development of the idea of the ethical is as follows: Virtue is of one-fold nature, and appears primarily under the form of wisdom, *σοφία*, that is, a knowledge of the true and good. But in that wisdom discovers to the consciousness what in the moral life is really to be feared, and what not, it assumes a special form, and gives rise to the virtue of manliness or courage, *ἀνδρεία*. In that it teaches wherein the inner harmony of the soul consists, and how to hold the passions in subjection to reason, it assumes the form of temperance, *σωφροσύνη*. In that it properly orders the inner soul-harmony in its active relations to others, claiming its own rights and conceding the rights of others, it appears as justness. Thus the three virtues, manliness,

temperance, and justness, are the three phases of the one cardinal virtue, wisdom. Justness is made to include piety or holiness, by which man preserves a proper attitude toward the gods.

A fuller development of the virtues is not given. The reason of the particular four which are described rests rather in the wants of the State than of the individual. A special treatise on duties is superfluous, as in Plato's opinion the harmonious soul is of itself able to find the right in each particular conjuncture.

THE PLATONIC STATE.

It is a noteworthy advance of the ethical consciousness that morality is here conceived of not as belonging to the mere individual, but as finding its full expression in the *community*. But this thought is developed with such passionate theorizing one-sidedness that, in his ideal State, Plato has produced what appears in the eyes of practical reflection as a mere satirical caricature, and brought upon himself the charge of utterly impracticable Utopianism. It has been sought to save his reputation by holding that he never intended his State for realization. But both the charge and this apology are equally unjust to Plato. His "State" is plainly his most mature and favorite work. There is not the least evidence that his ideal was not intended for realization; there is, on the contrary, much evidence that he made repeated attempts, and had strong hopes of seeing it put into practice by Dionysius the Younger in Syracuse. Moreover, he himself teaches its applicableness in practice.

The State of Plato is diverse enough from modern ideas; but to Greeks, especially those who favored Doric politics, it was by no means so novel, and, in fact, it had been partially realized in the laws of Sparta. The Platonic State is especially instructive in its contrasts to the Christian ideas of the community, the Church, and the State. Let us notice them.

According to Plato it is not the individual, but the State, that is the properly moral person; and by the State all morality of the individual is conditioned and produced. Moral individuals do not make the State, but the State makes them. Without and apart from the State there is no proper morality, but only barbarism. The object of the State is, hence, to make of the citizens morally good men.

The State is a simple moral organism corresponding to the three forms of the soul-life. In its teaching, defending, and victualing functions it represents reason, courage, and sensuousness in the three classes, the wise, and therefore ruling ones, the warriors, and the producers. It realizes inward harmony, and hence justness and happiness, by assuming the reins of the arbitrary individual will and assigning and forcing upon each the precise sphere of his activity. There must be strict separation of classes, the rulers allotting to each his rank. The special virtue of the producers is temperance or modesty. Those of both the warriors and rulers are bravery and wisdom. The rulers and warriors are gold and silver; the producers are but ignoble brass. This class is not to meddle with politics, but only with trade and agriculture. Slavery is a matter of course, though, when possible, only non-Greeks should be enslaved.

Of the rulers the essential trait is wisdom. There can never be many acting rulers; it is best when there is only one, and he a philosopher. The good of the whole requires the unlimited dominion of the best—aristocracy or monarchy. As wisdom can find the best step in every case, the power of the rulers should not be hampered by many statutes. The wise regent will often, without law and against the will of individuals, realize the good of the State, and compel the citizens to allow themselves to be made happy.

A truly free personality is consequently ascribed only to the wise ruling ones; all others are, in the whole scope of their life, absolutely subject to the State. If some liberty is allowed to the third class, it is only out of contempt: "though cobblers are bad, it does not endanger the State." But the truly wise and manly citizen is in absolute tutelage to the State. The two upper classes, as the chief factors of the State, are by the State both reared, educated, and in their whole activity directed. Music and gymnastics, as tending to harmony, are the main elements in education. The rulers cannot enter on their functions before the age of fifty. Their training requires the additional sciences of mathematics and philosophy. Any other religious training than that given by philosophy Plato could not commend, as he well knew the worthlessness of the popular religion.

The all-embracing, all-determining State has all and unconditioned rights; the individual has rights only so far as the State concedes them. Even to his own life he has no right when the State can no longer profit by him. Physicians must let the incurably sick perish without help. The State alone may possess; individual property should not be allowed. The artisan class labors not for itself but for the State; by which regulation Plato hoped to have excluded all cause of social strife. Even poetry is subject to a strict censorship. The drama is utterly prohibited. The State prescribes the meters in which alone verse may be written, and of musical instruments allows only the lyre and the cithara.

THE PLATONIC FAMILY.

The family is not the foundation, but only a subordinate phase of the State. Personality has in it no rights. The person of one consort belongs not to the other, but to the State. Wedlock proper is hence not allowable. The citizen should beget children in the interest of the State, and his stimulus should not be love of the sex, but civic duty. The citizen may not select the wife who temporarily is allowed him; but the State gives her to him, ostensibly by lot, but, in fact, the rulers should "make use of falsehood and deception" in artfully controlling the lot so as always to bring about the most suitable matches. Men may beget between the ages of thirty and fifty-five years; women may bear between those of twenty and forty. Permanent marital relations are out of the question; in fact, a change of wives is expressly required. No one may regard his wife as exclusively his own. It is to be a fundamental principle for the free, active citizen, "that all the women shall be common to all the men, that no one should live entirely with another, and that also the children should be in common, the father neither knowing what child is his, nor the child who is its father." Hence children are to be taken from the mother immediately at birth and reared by the State, every precaution being used to prevent the mothers from ever recognizing the children they bore. They are to be suckled by the women in common, and promiscuously. The sickly and crippled are to be let perish. After the lapse of the prescribed age for procreating, the men and the women may have com-

merce with each other according to elective affinity, save only that births must be prevented, and, where this cannot be done, the children must be starved at birth.

The woman is not the mother of the family, she is a citizen with political duties; and she may even fill governmental offices. They must practice manly trades, and must participate, naked, in the gymnastic exercises. They must even march forth to war, though in battle they are to hold the rear position. For between men and women there is no other difference than that the former beget and the latter bear; the former are stronger, the latter weaker.

CASTE.

This family-annulling despotism of the State applies strictly only to the two higher classes, while the producing class is less cared for, and allowed greater liberty. The great problem of all moral social life, namely, to realize the good of the community through the moral freedom of the individual, Plato was unable to solve, save by giving a sweeping plenary authority to the civic organism at the utter sacrifice of all individual self-determination. Objective morality swallows up and precludes all subjective morality. This, however, is not peculiar to Plato; it is the Greek tendency in general. Rather do we find in him a decided advance. While the Spartan system, somewhat like the Chinese, gave remorseless sway to impersonal law, and did away with personal liberty in very essential things; and while in the Athenian democracy the irrational whim of the masses disposed of the fate of the individual, the Platonic system gives the former into the hands of the personal spirit, at least in the person of the philosophically-educated and tried regent. From the stand-point of heathen antiquity, which conceded no right of the individual as against the State, this is a real progress; and what appears to us as unnatural and one-sided in it is owing, not so much to the erroneousness of the step forward, as to the fundamental erroneousness of Greek philosophy in general.

That the Spirit of wisdom and power may and is to be poured out on all flesh, (Joel iii, 1,) that there is no acceptance of persons with God, but all are equally called to be children of the truth, such a thought is utterly unknown to all

antiquity, and hence also to its greatest philosopher. Of an absolute morality binding on all Plato knows nothing. To a Greek, civilization without slavery is inconceivable. The slave is incapable of morality, and even only a small minority of the freemen can practically attain to wisdom. Proclivities toward or against virtue are transmitted physically from parent to children. The ground for this classification of mankind into a rational minority, and an unreasoning passive majority, lies not exclusively in the general consciousness of the Greeks, but also in the peculiar ontological views of Plato himself. The primitive dualism of all being shows itself also in man. As the world is not an absolutely perfect expression of the spirit, and as the rational spirit is not an absolutely omnipotent power, but can only, more or less fully, impress itself on the primitive stubborn chaotic substratum of all actuality, without being able perfectly to dominate and spiritualize it, so also in humanity do the rationally-enlightened few stand over against the unreasoning and relatively unspiritual many, whose destiny it is to be shaped and led by the few.

ETHICAL PROGRESS.

The real advance of Plato beyond former ethical views consists in the fact that, freeing the idea of *the good* from all dependence on the mere pleasure of the individual, he conceived it as *per se* valid and based in God himself, and, hence, described morality as Godlikeness, as the image of God in man, as, in fact, the very essence of rationality itself, and that, consequently, he regarded the moral life as a harmonious unity growing out of the one principle of wisdom. But by not fully freeing himself from the dualism so characteristic of heathen thought, he rendered it impossible for him to rise to the conception of the entire freedom of God and man, and, in fact, to that of a perfect morality. True personality is recognized neither in its scope and rights, nor in its guilt. There remains in all existence, even in the highest moral life, a stubborn, indelible, spirit-hampering element of primitive chaos, over which God himself is not absolute master. The barrier to perfect morality lies, not in the transgression of the individual, but in this uncongenial primitive element of his and of all other nature. The possibility and duty of morality are differ-

ent for the different classes, but even the freest man is not entirely free. The moral freedom of the philosophers is hampered by their corporeality; that of the free citizens, by the supervision of the rulers; and that of the slaves, by the whole weight of the body politic. And from the might of this hinderance to moral freedom there is no redemption in this world, but only in the future, and through death. Morality bears neither in its realization nor in its perversion an historical character, does not aim at a general shaping of the world's history; and even the ideal State is but a theater for the skill of the individual rulers without an all-embracing cosmopolitan purpose. And the moral consciousness itself hardly rises above an individual character, as its connection with the divine consciousness is but loose and unessential.

But the general gain to ethics through Plato is far from insignificant. Light and order spring out of crude confusion. Ethics is no longer a mass of disjointed maxims, but has come to a partial self-consciousness. But Plato lingers so much in general principles that he hardly comes into detailed contact with every-day life. In these general principles there are, as far as it was possible from a heathen stand-point, some slight approaches toward the Christian consciousness; and there would have been much greater had the philosopher succeeded in severing the chain which held the floating ship still fast to the shores of naturalism—that is, if he could have once freed himself of the notion of a primitive uncreated spirit-clogging matter, and exchanged his $\mu\eta\ \delta\nu$ for an $\sigma\iota\kappa\ \delta\nu$. But this he did not. Aristotle himself could not solve, but only disguise, the unwelcome problem of dualism. But so long as free spirit is not made the basis of being, the true ethical idea is impossible, and moral efforts have no sufficient motive.

While, on the one hand, the recognition of a hampering limit to the moral life may seem to be an approach to the Christian idea of general depravity, on the other it is a wider departure from the same; for this limit is not placed in moral guilt, that is, in the sphere of freedom, but in that of a primitive, fatalistic substratum of nature. It did not spring from an historical deed, (the fall,) and hence is not to be removed by an historical deed, (redemption.) The oft-expressed painful consciousness of the moral disorder of the world leads to no

thought of divine intervention. The sage, by wisdom, frees himself from imperfection as far as possible; and he frees others by philosophy and by absolutistic statemanship, but not by a sanctifying, humanitarian, historical breaking into the course of history, as does Christianity.

In his idea of the State there lies a presentiment of the truth that morality is not merely of individual, but also of social character; but from this presentiment he speedily retreats. His State is not a shaping factor in general history. Springing up not out of human society, but out of a philosophic brain, it continues to exist for the benefit of the favored few. Looking to no general reformation of the world, it is an isolated individual existing along side of many others like itself. It may be very small, need not have more than one hundred free citizens. And in this view of the State Plato was self-consistent. He had no thought of making entire humanity an object of moral beneficence, no thought that international peace might be hoped for. On the contrary, war was to him a normal condition of society; Greeks and non-Greeks were by nature enemies. Let this State theory of Plato, which was planned for the most gifted nation of the world, be but compared with the theocratic State of the Old Testament—with its constant world-historical goal, its fundamental purpose of salvation, and therefore of peace and universal brotherhood, and slowly realizing itself in the bosom of an unthoughtful, uncongenial race, and the immense superiority of the latter appears at once.

RELIGIOUS DEFECTIVENESS.

The feeblest side of Plato's ethics is in its religious bearing. To the beautiful thought of Godlikeness he does not hold fast. The making of the ethical depend on God's will was foreign to him, and must have been so, as he had no thought of a revelation of that will. He based it on the rational consciousness of man. But that this consciousness could exist in all men he did not venture to hope. Hence he placed the moral guidance of the masses in the hands of the philosophers, supplying, by the wisdom of these, the lack of a divine revelation. Also his deeply-conceived idea of God he does not develop into its consequences and find in it the basis of the ethical. It is true, he is far from the folly of those modern theories which make

morality independent of piety ; for he makes piety an essential element of all moral living, and derives, even from the divine judgment after death, a mighty motive to the same ; still, however, he does not make piety the spring of all the virtues. It is simply one of the virtues, and not even the highest, but only a branch of justness. And he does not venture to base it on his own noble idea of God as unity, but on the *gods* of the popular religion. But as he himself indignantly exposes the immorality of the whole system of Greek mythology, and bitterly censures the sentiments of Homer—nay, for moral reasons, banishes his poems from his ideal State—it is difficult to say how he justifies piety toward the popular gods. This is, in fact, a signal defect in his ethical system as a whole.

ARISTOTLE : GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

Aristotle, the completer of the Platonic, and, in fact, of Greek philosophy in general, though in many respects independent of Plato, was far inferior to him in speculative height of thought. He first reduced ethics to a separate systematic science, related on the one hand to physics and on the other to politics. His reduction of Plato's dualism to the least possible quantum does not lead him to a deriving of the ethical idea from the idea of God, but, on the contrary, to a more confident basing of it on the rational consciousness of men. A healthy psychology gives ethics a solid basis ; but the ignoring of the Platonic antagonism of the ideal and the real gives it a morally feebler coloring.

But more in detail. Aristotle gave ethics not only its own name, but, in the main, the form which it retained till toward the close of the Middle Ages. His treatise, in ten books, abounds in striking thoughts and in acute empirical observations ; but as a system it has many defects and hiatuses. Few general principles are scientifically developed ; much is merely aphoristic. He confessedly does not aim at strict demonstrations, as the subject only admits of probability. Hence his style, in contrast to Plato's poetic loftiness, sinks mostly into dry, popular reflections.

Though not rising to the full conception of a creative God, Aristotle drives still further into the back-ground than Plato the antagonism between God and primitive unconditioned mat-

ter. Though reluctant to admit such antagonism at all, he yet fails to utter the only thought that could free him from it, the thought with which the Bible opens. To him the world is not simply the best possible one; it is the perfect expression of the will of God. Hence he loses sight of Plato's notion of an evil element present in all reality. All reality is good. Corporeality is no longer man's prison; the body is the normal organ of the soul. There has been no historical fall of man. The mass of mankind, it is true, have no natural propension to virtue, being governed by passion and fear; but the better gifted free-born are by nature thoroughly good, and hence have in reason a pure course of ethical knowledge. By virtue of this theory Aristotle finds for himself, in the subjective spirit, a perfectly safe footing; and although he conceives of God as the absolute rational spirit, even more decidedly than Plato, yet he associates the contemplation of nature and mind less closely with the idea of God than did the latter. Viewing the world as more perfectly the expression of God's mind than did Plato, he can more confidently than he interrogate Nature, and trust in her answers as direct, divine truth. He feels, much less than Plato, the need of the supernatural.

Aristotle makes morality spring wholly out of the subject; it is not so much conformity to the Divine Will, as simply the life-course which is demanded by man's own nature. While in Plato there was the partially clear feeling that the moral goal of life consisted in Godlikeness, in pleasing God, and hence was of objective character, in Aristotle it is the subjective element which predominates—the moral goal being the personal well-being of the subject. In Plato the highest and best is transmundane and ideal; in Aristotle all ideal is also real and actual. The present world is morally the perfect expression of God's will. Hence in Aristotle we find no trace of that Platonic longing after something better, and of that painful sentiment that the embodied soul is a bird of Paradise ensnared in the toils of prosaic matter. With him life is no longer tragical. Poetic inspiration gives place to commonplace contentment. But in this satisfaction with the actual world there is far less approach to the Christian view than in Plato's consciousness of an inner antagonism in the universe. Plato's soaring mysticism gives place to an earth-looking rationalism.

The bright feature of Aristotle's ethics is its psychological basis; but the very fact that it is almost exclusively of psychological character, and is rooted neither in religion nor in history, constitutes also its weakness. While Plato so strongly insists on the immortality of the soul, and finds in it a stay for morality, Aristotle throws it doubtfully into the background. Nay, he expressly calls it absurd (*ἄτοπον*) to hold that man is happy only after death. His morality is only for this life. He expressly designates death as the greatest of evils, (*φοβερωτάτων ὁ θάνατος*;) "for it is the end of all; and for the deceased there seems to be no longer good or evil."

NATURE AND KINDS OF VIRTUE.

All rational effort has as its goal a *good*. The highest effort aims at the highest good. This highest good is perfect happiness, consisting, not in quietism, but in the active life of the rational spirit, and therefore in virtue, which, on its part, includes in itself the feeling of happiness. Virtue itself is either rational or ethical, according as it relates to reason or to sensuousness. The former springs from learning, the latter from practicing. As good consists in harmony—that is, in a right proportion—evil consists in an excess or a defect. Hence virtue is the observance of the just mean between two non-virtues, that is, vices. The condition of moral action is perfect freedom of will, to which, in opposition to the notion of Socrates that the knowledge of the right leads of necessity to its performance, Aristotle holds fast.

More in detail: It is the nature of rationality to be active, to will. The aim of all willing is a seeming or real good. Of objects aimed at, some are only means to higher goods. But striving, if it be rational, must look to a perfect good, having its end (*τέλος*) in itself. Honor, riches, knowledge, are but means to the supreme good. This good is the perfection of the person, his well-being, (*εὐδαιμονία*;) the power of a life whose end is in itself, (*ζωῆς τέλειος ἐνέργεια*.) This well-being, being more comprehensive than our "happiness," which is only subjective, is both subjective and objective. And it is not an ideal that is to be realized in the future, but it is the actually realized state of every inwardly and outwardly well-conditioned sage. It is not a sum of differ-

ent goods; it is in itself a whole, of which the manifold and lesser goods are but as many phases. It is not simply vegetative or sensuous life, but it is rationally active life. It is not apart from, or a mere result of, virtue, but includes in itself both virtue and its necessary fruit—happiness. It can hence be said that the highest good consists in practicing all virtue; though Aristotle admits that perfect well-being includes more than is directly given by virtue, namely, wealth, honorable descent, beauty, health, etc. But with this admission Aristotle breaks the logic of his system. For if there are conditions of the highest good which are independent of personal moral perfection, and which, consequently, the truly virtuous man may lack, then is the moral order of the world imperfect, and virtue has an insufficient motive. In order to attain to the highest good, man is required to seek for objects which are not included in a virtuous life! As Aristotle does not admit the moral depravity of mankind, he is involved here in an insoluble contradiction. But he prefers to be inconsistent rather than, in the interest of his system, deny an evident fact to whose explanation he had no clue.

But wherein now consists virtue? In man there is a twofold life, sensuousness and rationality, which are often in conflict. Sensuousness—appetite, passion—so far as voluntary, should be guided by reason. Virtue has therefore two phases, as related to the supremacy of reason, and to the subordination of sensuousness. In the one case it is thought-virtue; in the other, ethical virtue, (*ἀρετὴ διανοητικὴ καὶ ἠθικὴ*.) The former is wisdom; the latter are temperance, liberality, etc. Wisdom is a virtue, as being meritorious and praiseworthy. The term "ethical" is here used in the narrower sense of *practical* usages. Now it is evident that this division of the virtues is inadequate, as there are strictly spiritual virtues, such as humaneness, truthfulness, thankfulness, which have nothing to do with sensuousness, and are yet not intellectual or thought-virtues. And if wisdom be taken in the wide Platonic sense, then are these ethical virtues not co-ordinate, but subordinate, to it.

Intellectual virtues, says Aristotle, can be taught and learned; ethical virtues spring from repetition, are, in fact, habits. By nature we have no virtues, but only a capacity therefor. Virtuous actions are not so much the fruit as the antecedent con-

dition of virtue, and man becomes virtuous only by repeatedly acting virtuously. The difficulty as to how and from what motive a man can act virtuously before he is virtuous, Aristotle admits, but does not solve. Virtue is defined as being not an affection, as love, hatred, fear, nor a capacity, but a developed capacity, a facility of action, a *ἐξίς*, namely, that facility by which man becomes good and does good. But this is a merely formal and unsignifying definition. To give it a substantial meaning Aristotle makes this resort: In every thing there are many wrong ways but only one right, as, for example, in shooting there are many directions for missing the mark, but only one for hitting it. The wrong of an action is either a *too much* or a *too little*; the right is the just mean between the two. A virtue in its full definition is therefore a voluntarily acquired facility in observing the just means, (*μεσότης*.) The middle course is best in all things. Courage is a virtue holding the mean between cowardice and rashness; temperance, between indulgence and insensibility; liberality, between prodigality and niggardliness, etc.

DEFECTIVENESS OF THE JUST-MEAN PRINCIPLE.

It is evident that this merely *quantitative* distinguishing of good and evil mistakes the very essence of morality, and places the criterion of the ethical, not in the conscience, but in the calculating understanding. Good differs from evil not in quality, but in quantity, degree; and the passage from one vice to its opposite leads through that middle point wherein consists the corresponding virtue. Aristotle is conscious of the imperfection of this definition of the ethical, and even admits that there are some moral actions to which the notion of "too much" or "too little" is inapplicable, such as envy, murder, theft, adultery; there being, for example, no just mean in, and no allowable degree of, adultery. And this is as much as to admit that in such cases virtue does differ qualitatively from vice. And if, in spite of this admission, as well as this other one, that the right mean stands sometimes nearer to one of the opposed vices than to the other, he does not abandon his formal definition of virtue, it only shows the great embarrassment of the honest theorist.

Morality presupposes free-will. Passion and sensual temp-

tations do not destroy freedom, but man can and should govern them by reason. The sage aims at what *is* the best; the multitude, at what seems the best. But it does not follow that men sin only from error; for personal consciousness and civil legislation hold an adult responsible for all the evil he does. It is true, the majority go astray only from error in judgment or from perversity of character; but this error and perversity are their own fault, and hence do not excuse them. Man may, even purposely, do what he acknowledges to be evil, mainly in that he aims not at the good, but at the agreeable. The notion that no one consciously does wrong is inconsistent with undeniable experience, and with the idea of a free-will. In this connection, Aristotle makes the surprising observation that he who has made his character evil can no more change it by willing, than he who has made himself diseased can, by willing it, become sound. An evil man can no more turn back in his course than a projected stone can return to the hand that threw it. This thought might have led him further, but he does not pursue it—does not inquire how moral reformation is possible. Moreover, he limits the effects of evil to the individual—knows nothing of its propagation from generation to generation. Every man, at least every free Greek, is by nature good, and has in his reason a perfectly adequate counterbalance to his lower propensities.

THE SEVERAL VIRTUES.

Aristotle treats in detail of the ethical virtues first, and in this order: courage, temperance, liberality, magnanimity, equanimity; then of the social virtues: politeness, truthfulness, modesty, justness; and, after these, of the intellectual virtues: prudence and wisdom. From another point of view, namely, the degree of moral power exercised, virtuousness assumes the two forms of simple self-mastery, and of heroic or divine virtue.

Differing from Plato, he does not treat first of wisdom, but of courage or manliness, (*ἀνδρία*.) By it man triumphs over the fear of death, whether in war, on the sea, or in sickness, and not from the hope of an imperishable crown, but simply from pleasure in duty and in the beautiful. As courage preserves the proper mental equipoise in view of evil, pain, etc., so the

second virtue, temperance, (*σωφροσύνη*), preserves it in regard to sensuous pleasure. By the third virtue, liberality, we give with discretion, and out of pleasure in the beauty of the act, to those who deserve, and especially to public purposes, such as theatrical exhibitions, popular banquets, equipments of ships, etc. Magnanimity, (*μεγαλοψυχία*), a virtue peculiar to the gifted, observes the mean between vain self-esteem and excessive humility. It is the ethical pride of the great man, in contrast to the becoming bearing of the common man, which is but modesty. Only he is magnanimous whose distinction of descent, possessions, social position and personal virtues enable him to seek and obtain the esteem of the wise and eminent, and to be indifferent to the opinion of the multitude. The virtue of equanimity holds the just mean between irascibility and phlegmatism. The failure, at the fit occasion, to show anger, or to defend one's self, or even to take revenge, is dishonorable and pusillanimous. Indulged revenge stills wrath; but one must not be excessive in it.

Without logical connection, Aristotle now passes to the social virtues. Between the vices of a fawning seeking-for-approbation and an anti-social rudeness stands the virtue of politeness; which is observed not merely toward friends, but toward all. Between boastfulness and ironical self-disparagement stands the just mean of truthfulness, especially in regard to one's self. But as praise of self is more offensive to others than disparagement, it is better to incline rather to the latter. The virtue of social facetiousness preserves the just mean in wit and joking, as opposed to clownishness and sarcasm. Of shamefulness Aristotle speaks briefly; but of its true and moral significance, as indicated in Gen. iii, 7, he has no conception.

The most important social virtue is justness, as relating chiefly to the observance of the rights of property. The rule of the just mean is here of different application, as it is absurd to speak of an excess of justness. Related to justness is the virtue of discreteness, or appropriate action in cases where the letter of the law does not enjoin a specific course. In some cases it declines, out of a sense of justice, a right which the law concedes. Man cannot be unjust toward himself; even suicide is a wrong, not against one's self, but against the State.

To the intellectual virtues, as prudence and wisdom, the rule

of the just mean is plainly inapplicable; they do not preserve the mean, they only discover it. Prudence (*φρόνησις*) is that spiritual readiness by which, in each accidental conjuncture, we embrace fitting practical courses of action. Wisdom (*σοφία*) is a higher virtue, dealing not with the contingent, but with the universal, the unchangeable, the ultimate. Prudence and wisdom are not the sole virtues, but they are as *ορθός λόγος*, the antecedent condition of the other virtues.

Aristotle now considers the general attendants of moral action, namely, pleasure, (*ἡδονή*), and well-being, or happiness, (*εὐδαιμονία*.) Pleasure does not always coincide with good. Many kinds of pleasure are goods and should be sought; others not. A legitimate pleasure is one which attends a virtuous act. Happiness is not a mere state, but rather it is rational *living*. As learning is the highest form of life, the acquirement of truth coincides with the highest happiness. It resembles the happiness of the gods, which consists not in outward, but in rational activity.

SOLIDARITY.

The idea of solidarity, or community of interest among the members of society, so strongly insisted on by Plato, is still more emphasized by Aristotle, without, however, rising above the Græco-heathen stand-point. The idea of the universal brotherhood of man is wholly wanting. The family is not regarded as the basis of society, but only as one of its phases. Connubial and filial love are but special forms of friendship. Friendship is not so much a duty as a mere outgrowth of our seeking for personal well-being. The community is not based on friendship, but on the sum total of moral laws which make up the State. The object of the State is to be an instrument through which the wise may hold in check and habituate to good the great mass of the morally immature.

To friendship Aristotle devotes two whole books of his *Ethics*. Friendship is not so much a single virtue as a special phase of virtue in general. It includes love, but does not coincide with the idea of Christian love. It is not objective and universal, but subjective and individual. It loves, not so much for the sake of the loved one, as for that of the lover. It extends not to mankind at large; such a duty was never dreamed of by a

Greek. It is true, friendship seeks the good of its object, but not primarily and directly. Friendship makes the friend ours in a certain sense, and we love *ours* in him. It loves only in proportion as its object is of worth to it. Self-sacrificing maternal love Aristotle observes, but does not comprehend.

He speaks but briefly of wedlock and sexual love. Marriage is the most natural of friendships. It looks not merely to offspring, but also to mutual aid and culture in the whole sphere of life. It is man's to protect and be faithful to the wife, and, in his appropriate sphere, to govern her. Children are under perpetual obligation to parents, though the father may cast off the son.

THE STATE.

Aristotle's conception of the State is quite characteristic. It does not rest on the family, or on the consent of the governed, but is formed by the wisest, the most gifted, for the general good. It does not aim at radical reformation of the masses, but only, as far as practicable, to hold their evil tendencies in check. Only the few can attain to the highest virtues, and their motive to this is simply the happiness resulting from virtue in this transitory life.

The State is to the citizen, the family, etc., as the animating body to its members. It presupposes the threefold subordination of husband and wife, parent and children, master and slave. Insisting more than Plato on the education of the citizen to higher freedom, he does not render the State so despotically absolute. But it is not the product of the moral life of the individuals, it is the necessary antecedent condition thereof. The State is the generator; the moral citizen, the product. The whole precedes the parts.

The relation of master and slave is a weighty element in the State. Aristotle was the first to give a formal theory and defense of slavery. Slavery is neither of legal nor of violent origin, it is natural. An artisan might as well be without tools as the head of a household without slaves. Slaves are to their masters as the body to the soul. Men are everywhere of the two classes, the thoughtful and the unthinking, the governing and the governed. These are the body, those the soul, of the race. Nature makes the difference; and it is a blessing

to the lower classes that they are spiritually controlled and guided by the higher. These lower classes, these slaves by nature, Aristotle expressly says, are the non-Greeks, the barbarians. Slaves have no rights, and are as much in the power of their masters as are domestic animals.

Aristotle subjects the Platonic State to a sharp criticism. He rejects the community of goods and of wives; but in giving his own views he is not very explicit. He admits to a share in the Government only such as have leisure to cultivate the higher virtues. Day-laborers, artisans, and farmers are excluded. A normal State looks to the good of all of its free citizens. It may be a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy of the free citizens. Abnormal perversions of these are tyranny, oligarchy, and universal democracy. It is always best that the most gifted should govern. Aristotle evidently prefers a constitutional monarchy. He greatly admired Alexander.

To secure a vigorous citizenship the State regulates marriage, and the care of children. Girls should marry at eighteen; men, at about thirty-seven. It prescribes the mode of life of the pregnant. "No physically defective (*πενηρωμένον*) child is to be raised"—it is to be let perish. But where traditional laws forbid this, superfluous population must be prevented by abortion, brought about before the fetus has life and feeling. The State oversees the rearing of children up to seven years, and then entirely assumes it. Boys are to be trained in grammar and drawing, gymnastics and music.

SLAVERY.

In none of the possible forms of the State does Aristotle rise to the idea of genuine freedom. Every-where it rests on slavery; nowhere does it look to educating the slaves into freemen. And it is no marked instance of impartiality when a modern, unchristian, self-styled humanitarian school would have us take the Greeks as the apostles of true humanitarianism, and their age and opinions as the "paradise of the human soul." The very opposite was the case. To the Greeks all non-Greeks were by nature only a sort of half-men. War upon them, and slavery for them, were the natural prerogatives of the Greeks. The Greek knows no mission of the word but only of the sword.

GREEK ETHICS AT ITS HIGHEST.

Non-Christian morality attained in Aristotle to its highest perfection. This morality is that of the natural and self-complaisant man. It lacks a consciousness of the historical origin and workings of sin, of the antagonism of the natural man to the moral idea, and of an earnest moral struggle against evil; and instead of this it presents a natural distinction of mankind into the morally incapable multitude and the naturally moral and free-born few. Morality rests not on religious consciousness, nor on love to God or man; but on a direct intellectual knowledge of the good on the part of man. Not love or benevolence, but *intellectual calculation of advantage*, is the motive to associations among mankind. Thus the ethical views of Aristotle, and hence of the Greeks, stand in direct antagonism to those of Christianity. And it is important to mark this, as a means of understanding the wide-reaching and often perverting influences of Aristotle on the development of Christian ethics even down to the present day.

The Christian consciousness rests throughout on the recognition of the necessity of general redemption, occasioned by the historical entrance of sin into the race. But of this Aristotle knows nothing; for, though he views the mass of mankind as incapable of high virtue, it is not because of an innate adverse-ness to virtue, but simply because of this normal non-endowment therefor—in some sense as brutes are thus non-endowed. And over against these he places the free Greek sage, who is absolutely and normally good, and, of course, without any need of redemption. And equally unchristian is the spirit of lofty self-respect and contemptuous unconcern with which these chosen few may, and do, look down upon all the rest of mankind.

In fact the perfect ideal of manhood, as conceived by the Greeks, is, in some essential respects, the very opposite of the Christian character. Take, as an example, the following picture of the magnanimous sage, as given by Aristotle himself, and which may justly be regarded as the highest ideal of character to which the Greek mind ever rose. In speaking of magnanimity, the crown of all the virtues, he says: "Magnanimous is he who is worthy of great things, and who esteems himself as worthy of great things. . . . The greatest of out-

ward goods is honor; the magnanimous man has, therefore, to act becomingly in regard to honor and dishonor. . . . As the magnanimous one is worthy of the greatest things, he must necessarily be perfectly good : to him belongs all that is great in every virtue ; . . . hence it is very difficult to be magnanimous. . . . In great honors, and honors tendered to him by distinguished men, the magnanimous man rejoices, but moderately, as if such honors were due him, or even fell below his deserts ; for to perfect virtue no sufficient honor can be offered. And yet he accepts it, because there can be no greater one shown him. But honors offered to him by ordinary men, or for unimportant things, he despises, for they are not worthy of him." After adding that favorable external circumstances are necessary to true magnanimousness, and that the magnanimous one thinks only very moderately of men and things, and esteems very few things so highly as to expose himself to dangers on their account, he continues : "He is inclined to confer benefits, but disdains to receive a favor ; for the former benefits an eminent personage, while the latter implies inferiority. If he does receive a favor, however, he returns it in greater measure ; for thereby the one who before had the advantage is now made a debtor. Also he gladly recalls to mind those to whom he has done favors, but not those from whom he has received favors ! For the receiver of a benefit is subordinate to him who confers, whereas his own aim is, to be pre-eminent over others. For this reason he is glad to have the former (his benefactions) mentioned, but disdains to hear of the latter (the favors received). . . . He remains inactive and unconcerned when the matter is not one of great honor, nor a great work. He does but little, but what he does is great and brings fame. He is free-spoken, for he cherishes contempt. He speaks the truth, save when indulging in irony ; and he does this when speaking with the masses. He is never astonished, for nothing seems great to him. . . . The movements of a magnanimous man are slow, his voice low-pitched, and his pronunciation measured. For he who is not interested for many things is in no hurry ; and he who esteems nothing great is not enthusiastic." Such is Aristotle's picture of a *μεγαλόψυχος*. In the eyes of Christianity it is that of a courtly fool ; but he proposes it to us as the *beau ideal* of virtue !

An essential defect in Aristotle's ethics, and one wherein it falls far below Plato's, is its lack of a religious character. It fails almost entirely to teach that morality is based on the will of God, that it brings man in communion with God, that man has a direct moral relation to God, and that piety is the mainspring of virtue. And this is all the more surprising as Aristotle's very correct conception of God as a rational, living, personal First Cause would naturally have led to such a view of the ground of morality. It was evidently not so much the logic of his philosophy as the general feebleness of the Greek religious consciousness that prevented him from giving morality a religious sanction.

But by this very failure he deprived morality of a sufficient motive. For he repeatedly asserts, as against Socrates, that the knowledge of the good does not necessarily lead to its performance; that, in fact, there may be an antagonism between knowing and willing. But if knowing the good does not lead to its willing, what does? It is not love, for that is only a phase of friendship, and hence is simply a single phenomenon of the moral life along side of many others. Misconceiving, thus, of the true nature of this element, which plays in Christianity so important a part—binding all mankind into one, and the whole to God—his ethical system lacks a sufficient anchorage, and is tossed hither and thither among sands and waves. And it is because of this want of knowledge of the moral power of love that Aristotle can assign no other motive for the civil virtues of the great multitude than that of fear. This admission of a possible antagonism between knowledge and volition, though evincing, on the one hand, that Aristotle was a less prejudiced observer of actual life than Socrates, yet, on the other, renders it impossible for him, consistently with his own ethical system, adequately to explain the phenomena of the moral life.

ART. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL—OF THE NEW DOCTRINE OF INFALLIBILITY. Our account of the Vatican Council in the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" closed with the adoption of the *schema de fide* on the 26th of April. On the 29th of April the Council took a fresh start, the general congregation of that day beginning to discuss the reformed *schema* on the Little Catechism. The discussion was closed in the general congregation of April 30, and on May 11 the vote was taken, which resulted in its adoption. The total number of votes given was 591.

In the general congregation of the 13th of May the oral discussion on the important question of Papal Infallibility commenced. The *schema* was comprised in a preamble and four chapters, and was known to form the first part of the dogmatic constitution *de Ecclesia Christi*. Before being submitted to discussion the text of the *schema* had been distributed to the fathers, who in due course of time transmitted their observations upon it to the deputation *de fide*. These observations were then maturely examined by the members of the deputation, and a printed report of their views on them was sent to the residence of each Bishop. The debate itself is known to have been long and animated, many Bishops entering a very earnest protest against the promulgation of such an innovation. Authentic reports of the speeches have not yet been published; all correspondents from Rome designate Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia and Illyricum in Croatia; Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans in France; Archbishop Darboy, of Paris; Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg in Würtemberg; Cardinal Archbishop Renschel, of Vienna; Cardinal Archbishop Prince Schwartzfemberg, of Prague, as those Bishops which spoke with the greatest effect against the proposed doctrine. The Roman correspondent of the *Catholic World*, of New York, Father Hecker, who gives the most interesting account of the Council which we have yet met in any Roman Catholic paper, thus classifies the Bishops who showed

an opposition to the doctrine of Infallibility.

First in conviction, in determination, and in influence were the Gallicans, properly so called, who held and taught the very opposite of the proposed dogma. They were mostly men who had been bred in this teaching, and who deeply revered the memories of those who held and taught it in past times. This class was not very numerous, though it grew larger in the course of the Council by the accession of those whose examination of the question convinced them of the claim of Gallicanism to their adherence.

The second class comprised those who, believing the doctrine themselves, or, at least, favoring it speculatively, did not think it capable of definition, not deeming the tradition of the Church clear enough on this point.

A third class, the most numerous, regarded the definition as possible, but practically fraught with peril to the Church, as impeding conversions, as exasperating to governments. For the sake of peace, and for the good of souls, they would not see it proclaimed as of faith.

The regulations of the Council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the proposal being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made on the *schema* in general, one hundred and fifty Bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of Infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the Pope a protest against the closing of the general discussion, as it had deprived the Council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments against the new doctrine.

The secrecy which was enjoined upon all the members of the council has not been fully observed. A number of papers, and in particular the *Gazette of Augsburg*, succeeded not only in obtaining full accounts of the speeches, but even important documents which were to be kept secret. Several works even appeared, giving a detailed account of all the proceedings of the Council, and, though it must not of course be expected that works of this kind are wholly free

from inaccuracies, it was hardly denied by any adherent of Rome that every important fact connected with the Council had found its way to the public prints. Special irritation was produced in Rome by a work published in Paris under the title, *Ce qui se passe du Concile*, because the minuteness of its statements was in itself conclusive proof that they were derived from members of the Council. These works specially impugned the freedom of the Council on three grounds:

1. The appointment of the congregation, the members of which were named by the sovereign pontiff, and who received or rejected the *postulata*, or propositions, to be presented to the Council for discussion.

2. The dogmatic deputation having been composed of those in favor of the definition, and the members having been put on it by management; moreover, this deputation exercised a controlling influence in the Council.

3. The interruption of those who were giving expression to their opinions in the exercise of their right to speak.

These charges have, however, not been brought only by the above pamphlets, but a number of Bishops have publicly expressed the same accusations, and in particular with regard to the third point a protest signed by a large number of Bishops was presented to the Pope.

The discussion of the *schema* as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole *schema* by name, with *placet*, or *placet juxta modum* or *non-placet*. The result was as follows: 451 *placets*, 62 *placets juxta modum*, and 88 *non-placets*. Some of the *placets juxta modum* recommended the insertion of words that would make the decree clearer and stronger. The *schema* was accordingly altered and the amendments were retained in the general congregation, held Saturday, July 16th. On Sunday morning was distributed a *monitum*, by which the fathers were notified that the fourth public session would be held on Monday, July 18th, at nine o'clock. The 18th of July will henceforth be a memorable day in the history of the Church. The feeling among the Bishops appears not to have been a very joyous one. Even Father Hecker writes in his report:

The thought that, although a great and most beneficial act was to be done, still

there were not a few of the fathers who thought otherwise than the majority in a matter about to be made binding on the conscience of all, was not calculated to heighten the external manifestations of cheerfulness, whatever feelings of thankfulness to Providence for the event was in the heart.

At nine o'clock Cardinal Barili began a low mass without chant. At the end of it the small throne for the Gospels was placed on the altar and upon it the copy of the Scriptures. In a few moments the Pope entered, preceded by the Senate and the officers of the court, and went to his throne in the apsis of the aula. The customary prayers were recited by him; the litany of the saints was chanted and the "Veni Creator Spiritus" intoned, the people present taking part; after which the Bishop of Fabriano ascended the pulpit and read the schema to be voted on, and finished with asking the fathers whether it pleased them. Next the name of each prelate was called, when 534 answered *placet*, 2 replied *non-placet*, and 106 were absent, some because sick, the far greater number not willing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known officially to Pius IX., he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, "Wherefore," he continued, "by virtue of four apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred Council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read." The crowd outside of the hall shouted *Viva Pio Nono*; *Papa infallibile*, and the Pope intoned the *Te Deum*. The session ended with the apostolic benediction from the Pope, accompanied by an indulgence for all assisting.

The following is a faithful translation of Chapter IV. of the schema, which treats of Papal infallibility:

OF THE INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF IN TEACHING.

This holy see hath ever held—the unbroken custom of the Church doth prove—and the Œcumenical Councils, those especially in which the East joined with the West in union of faith and of charity, have declared that in this apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff holds over the universal Church, as successor of Peter the prince of the Apostles, there is also contained the supreme power of authoritative teaching. Thus the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth this solemn profession:

"The first law of salvation is to keep

the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, (Matt. xvi, 18,) these words, which he spake, art proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the full and true firmness of the Christian religion." [Formula of St. Hormisdas, Pope, as proposed by Hadrian II. to the Fathers of the Eighth General Council, (Constantinop. IV.,) and subscribed by them.]

So too, the Greeks, with the approval of the second Council of Lyons, professed that the holy Roman Church holds over the universal Catholic Church a supreme and full primacy and headship, which she truthfully and humbly acknowledges that she received, with fullness of power, from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince or head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor; and as she, beyond the others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so, if any questions arise concerning faith, they should be decided by her judgment. And, finally, the Council of Florence defined that the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding and ruling and governing the universal Church, (John xxi, 15-17.)

In order to fulfill this pastoral charge our predecessors have ever labored unwearyingly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the Bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long established custom of the Churches, (S. Cyril, Alex. and S. Celest. Pap.,) and the form of ancient rule, (St. Innocent I. to Councils of Carthage and Milevi,) referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail. (St. Bernard ep. 190.) And the Roman Pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the Church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as Divine providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be

held, which, by the aid of God, they knew to be conformable to the holy Scriptures and the apostolic traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter, that they may make known new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully set forth the revelation delivered by the Apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this their apostolic teaching all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour made to the prince of the Apostles: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren. (Conf. St. Agatho, Ep. ad Imp. a Conc. Œcum. VI. approbat.)

Therefore, this gift of truth, and of faith which fails not, was divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors in this chair, that they should exercise their high office for the salvation of all, that through them the universal flock of Christ should be turned away from the poisonous food of error and should be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that, the occasion of schism being removed, the entire Church should be preserved one, and, planted on her foundation, should stand firm against the gates of hell.

Nevertheless, since in this present age, when the saving efficacy of the apostolic office is exceedingly needed, there are not a few who carp at its authority, we judge it altogether necessary to solemnly declare the prerogative which the only begotten Son of God has designed to unite to the supreme pastoral office.

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition handed down from the commencement of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed, that, when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of Pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

And if any one shall presume, which

God forbid, to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

Given in Rome, in the Public Session, solemnly celebrated in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

Ita est.

JOSEPH, BISHOP OF ST. POLTEN,
Secretary of the Council of the
Vatican.

A large number of the Bishops returned home immediately after the promulgation of the doctrine, and it is announced that the regular proceedings of the Council will not be taken up again until some time in November.

There appeared to be a difference of opinion as to whether the Infallibility of the Pope was to be regarded as a doctrine of the Church immediately after the promulgation, or only after the signing of all of the acts of the Council by the Bishops at the close of the transac-

tions. A letter from Cardinal Antonelli to one of the Papal Nuncios declared in the name of the Pope that Rome regarded Infallibility as a doctrine of the Church from the moment of its promulgation, and that it would regard as a heretic every body who would refuse submission.

The great war which broke out soon after the promulgation of Papal Infallibility averted public opinion both from the Council and from the attitude of the Opposition. The Bishops belonging to the Opposition acted with great reserve. Many theological scholars, on the contrary, were very outspoken in rejecting both the doctrine and the claims of the Council to an œcumenical character. Among those who publicly refused submission were Father Hyacinthe, of France, and a large number of theological scholars in Germany, one of whom, Professor Michelis, of France, declared the Pope to be a heretic.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York.)—1. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. (Concluded.) 2. Oosterzee's Theology of the New Testament. 3. Farrar on the Constitution. 4. The Problem of History. 5. The Mather Papers. 6. Protoplasm, or the Physical Basis of Life. 7. The Relation of Theology to the Preparatory Sciences. 8. The Felicity of God. 9. A New Analysis in Fundamental Morals. 10. New German Theological Literature.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Miracles. 2. Subterranean Rome. 3. Bible Chronology. 4. Gladstone's *Juventus Mundi*. 5. Exegesis of Hebrews xii, 18-24. 6. The True Humanity of Christ. 7. Exegetical Studies.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York.)—1. Tholuck's View of the Right Way of Preaching. 2. Heathen Views on the Golden Age, etc., compared with the Bible. 3. The Brothers Valdés. 4. Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede. 5. The Trial Period in History. 6. The General Assembly. 7. The Delegation to the Southern General Assembly. 8. The Evangelical Alliance. 9. Minority Representation in the Diocese of New Jersey.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1870. (Andover.)—1. The Crucifixion on Thursday—not Friday. 2. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 3. The Creative Period in History. 4. Recent Questions of Unbelief. 5. Demosthenes, and the Rhetorical Principles Established by his Example. 6. Revelation and Inspiration. 7. Exposition of 2 Cor. v, 14. 8. The Topography of Jerusalem. 9. Explorations in Palestine.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Law of Liberty. 2. The Law of Divorce. 3. Christian Experience. 4. Education of Children. 5. A Page of History and a Line of Revelation. 6. The Infallibility Dogma.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Boston.) 1. Joseph Abbott. 2. The Pilgrim Fathers. 3. A Disquisition Concerning Ecclesiastical Councils. 4. The Biblical Position of Woman. 5. Veni, Sancte Spiritus. 6. Extempore Preaching. 7. A National Conference. 8. Luther's Prayer. 9. Congregational Necrology.

CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW, July, 1870. (Chicago.)—1. Theism and Anti-Theism in their Relations to Science. 2. The Roots of Infant Baptism. 3. Probation Beyond Death. 4. The Doctrine of the Divine Name. 5. Theron Baldwin, D.D. 6. An Address at the Pilgrim Memorial Convention, held in Chicago, April 28, 1870.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Schmid's Dogmatic Theology. Translated from the German and Latin. 2. Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers. 3. Luther at the Diet of Worms. Translated from the Original Narrative. Published at Jena, in 1557. 4. Mission Work in the Lutheran Church of this Country. 5. The Divine Government: Rev. iv. 6. Martin Chemnitz and the Council of Trent. 7. Life and Writings of Flavius Josephus. 8. In Essentials, Unity. 9. Tennyson. 10. Eight Years among the Hindoos. 11. The Music and Song of the Ages.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, July, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Organic Redémption. 2. Casper Schwenkfeld and the Schwenkfelders. 3. Union with the Church. 4. The Ministry Adapted to the Times. 5. What is Heaven? 6. The Mystery of Iniquity. 7. Dogmatic Theology.

NEW ENGLANDER, July, 1870. (New Haven.)—1. St. Francis and his Time. 2. Is there a Probation between Death and the Judgment? 3. Henry Ward Beecher. 4. The Free Churches of England. 5. Yale College—Some Thoughts Respecting its Future. 6. How the Rev. Dr. Stone Bettered his Situation. 7. Address of M. de Pressensé, at Amsterdam, on the Bible and the School. 8. President McCosh's Logic.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER AND ANTIQUARIAN JOURNAL, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. Discourse of the Rev. Edmund F. Slafer, A.M. 2. Thomas Sherwin, A.M. 3. The Preble Family. 4. The Squamscott Patent. 5. Letter from Rev. Solomon Stoddard to Governor Dudley. 6. Commissions from Royal Governors of Massachusetts. 7. An American Shrine—The First Church in Charlestown. 8. Instructions to Matthew Cary about bringing Prisoners from Canada. 9. Unpublished Letters. 10. Josiah Barker, and his Connection with Ship-Building in Massachusetts. 11. The Coffin Family. 12. Stephen Bryant and his Descendants. 13. Bibliography of the Local History of Massachusetts. 14. Documents Relating to the Colonial History of Connecticut. 15. Notes and Queries. 16. N. E. Historic and Genealogical Society.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. American Art Museums. 2. The Session. 3. Competitive Examinations in China. 4. Our Currency, Past and Future. 5. Luther, and the early German Struggles for Freedom. 6. The Labor Question. 7. Chaucer.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1870. (Boston.)—1. Credibility and Inspiration of the New Testament. 2. The Time of Job. 3. The Septuagint. 4. The Moravian Missions. 5. Punishment. 6. The Historical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans with Especial Reference to Baur's Theory. 7. The Vestry, and its Uses. 8. Universalism a Practical Power. 9. Contributions to the History of Universalism.

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Freeman's History of the Norman Conquest. 2. The Education and Employment of Women. 3. Suggestions for the Repression of Crime. 4. The Congregational Ministry and its Education. 5. The Literary Character of Mr. Disraeli. 6. The Council of the Vatican. 7. Mr. Matthew Arnold and Puritanism.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. The Text of Chaucer. 2. The Baltic Provinces of Russia. 3. The Chief Victories of Charles V. 4. Galton on Hereditary Genius. 5. Sainte-Beuve. 6. Manuals of Ancient History. 7. Faraday. 8. Postal Telegraphs. 9. The Adventures of Audubon. 10. Disraeli's Lothair.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. Earl Stanhope's Reign of Queen Anne. 2. The Church and the Age. 3. Mr. Disraeli's Lothair. 4. The Police of London. 5. Dr. Newman's Grammar of Assent. 6. Baths and Bathing Places, Ancient and Modern. 7. The Rig Veda. 8. Letter-Writing. 9. Administration of the Army.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Assyrian Annals, B. C. 681-625. 2. Parpaglia's Mission to Queen Elizabeth. 3. Ben Jonson's Quarrel with Shakspeare. 4. Dr. Newman's Grammar of Assent. 5. Lothair. 6. Agriculture and Agrarian Laws in Prussia. 7. The Cisleithan Constitutional Crisis.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Michael Faraday. 2. The War in Paraguay. 3. Albert Durer. 4. Freeman's Norman Conquest. 5. The Licensing System. 6. Land Tenure. 7. The Bremen Apologetic Lectures. 8. St. Paul and Protestantism.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1870. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.) 1. Unpublished Letters, written by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 2. Indian Taxation; Lord Cornwallis's Land Settlement. 3. The Nationality Question in Austria. 4. The Future of the British Empire. 5. Shelley. 6. Colonial and American Pauperism. 7. Roman Catholicism: Present and Future.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1870. (London.) 1. Venice. 2. The Two Purifications of the Temple. 3. M. Baius and the Foundations of Jansenism. 4. Speculation and Practice; some Liberal Tendencies Considered. 5. Luthardt on Free Will and Grace. 6. John Jewel. 7. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné on the Council and Infallibility. 8. The Silence of Women in the Churches.

This Quarterly furnishes the following opinion of M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*:

It promises, when completed, to be beyond doubt the most comprehensive and valuable publication of the kind in the English language. The literature of all nations is laid under contribution to enrich its pages. The senior editor, Dr. M'Clintock, we regret to learn, died a few months ago amid his useful labors. He long occupied a prominent place in his own denomination, but was held in universal esteem among all the Churches of America. The preparation of materials for his department of the *Cyclopædia* engaged his anxious care. His work was so far completed when the Master summoned him away to his rest. The final revision of the remaining portions of this great work will devolve on Professor Strong and a large staff, thirty-one in number, of able coadjutors, who have all along been associated with the editors in the undertaking. We trust the publishers will be enabled to bring to a successful conclusion the enterprise they have hitherto so ably conducted, and thereby to confer a lasting benefit on the Church of Christ.

And the following notice of Professor Winchell's *Sketches of Creation*:

A more interesting and intelligent guide we could not wish. He combines scientific accuracy with a vividness and beauty of description which we have never seen equaled. His work is from beginning to end a grand panorama. The reader's attention is sustained throughout, and, while his mind is informed, his heart cannot but be stirred with feelings of awe and reverence, forcing from his lips the

adoring cry, "O Lord! how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches."

We thank Dr. Winchell for the great pleasure the perusal of this excellent and beautifully illustrated volume has afforded us, and we hope that he will be enabled to carry out his expressed intention of dealing in a subsequent work with the whole question of the relations of science to the Christian faith, a subject of pressing importance in the present day.

ART. IX.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1869, on the Bampton Foundation. By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. 12mo., pp. 397. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1870.

How clearly the Bible is a supernatural book, a self-evident miracle, is, from the neglect of a critical study of the connection between the Old Testament and the New, very inadequately realized. The whole drift of the Old looks forward to the New, the whole self-assertion of the New looks back to the Old. There are thousands of mutual ties, some of them minute fibers singly easy to break, others strong cords, forming in the whole a oneness of the two unparalleled in the history of human thought. This miraculous circularity is not to be found in any of the sacred books of the unchristian nations—the Vedas, the Shasters, or the Korans. It belongs to the Bible alone, and thus places the Bible *as alone* among all written monuments.

Dr. Smith's book is one of the most important efforts in our language at unfolding this miracle and making it patent to the mind of the Church. It is a historical survey of Old Testament prophecy especially in its anticipations of Christ and the Gospel ages. He first analyzes the nature of prophecy and the precise character of the ancient prophet from the earliest antiquity. Its rise is dim and sporadic in the twilight of antiquity. The prophet is not purely predictor, but revealer of the Divine mind, whether in regard to the future, present, or past. His utterance is oral, and his impulses and existence occasional.

At the close of the age of the Judges a great character arose, wonderful for his endowments, intellectual, ethical, and supernatural—the Prophet Samuel. He was the reformer of the past and the founder of a new era. Corresponding to his great character was the divine effusion of spiritual endowment that marked the

epoch. Thereby he was enabled to establish *the school of the prophets*, a sacred University, which, in a form more or less definite, remained until the captivity. This divine thrill from on high quickened the genius of Israel in every department of thought and life; and the intellectual and moral being of the nation moved thenceforward on a higher plane. Happy day, when every branch of human improvement recognized itself as but a radiation from the Divine! In Samuel's college there was one rare youth, the strains of whose inspired genius still roll in our ears and elevate our souls to God; one who as warrior, royal statesman, and sacred lyrist, was, despite of grievous errors, to render his name the type of that great Unknown who stood in the future as the "Hope of Israel." From Samuel and the Judgeship to David and the monarchy was an ascending step in theocratic history.

The next great epoch was the inauguration of written prophecy. When the monarchy arose and Jerusalem became the national center, a varied literature sprung into existence, the monarchs themselves leading the movement; books were published, libraries established and an enlightened public mind created. The sacred colleges were led by men of divine endowments, who studied with earnest interest the teachings of their predecessors as the basis whence their premonitions augured the divine purposes and shot their predictions farther and clearer into the future. Each prophet did not stand in a bleak lonesomeness. A critical general mind, scarce inferior to that of the prophet himself, judged his manifestations and embodied utterance after utterance into established doctrine. But for a long time the predictive utterances were oral. At length, when the brief power of Assyria was at its height, Jonah wrote his book announcing the wonderful fact of mercy upon repentance even for Heathendom—the first great startling type of the call of the Gentiles! Then followed Joel, announcing the great catholic truths quoted by Peter at the Pentecost. From the catholic generality of these two primal prophets Isaiah rises to deduce the most specific delineations of the coming God-man. In him prophecy culminates. Micah is his not unworthy contemporary in the sacred college. Then, through Jeremiah and Daniel, down to Malachi, numerous additional touches are given by each successive hand to finish out the picture of the Future One.

To the argument from this phenomenon of *prediction*, so patent in the Bible, so unparalleled in any other literature, there is no adequate answer. The Pantheistic axiom, *there can be no super-*

natural, is the sole ground upon which all counter-argument is based. But for this primal assumption of skepticism the phenomenon would be at once admitted, and the self-styled "higher criticism" would have no existence. On this basis it is first objected that prophecies are *obscure*; but the reply is, Fling out every obscure prediction and the perfectly clear ones are superabundant. It is next assumed that when they are clear they are written *after the event*; but the reply is, That all the events of Christianity, so clearly predicted, took place long after the Septuagint translation of the old canon; while other predictions, as the Jewish dispersion, are being fulfilled at the present hour.

With regard to the Messianic predictions the last subterfuge is that they fulfilled themselves: or, as Strauss puts it, the early Christians constructed the Christ-history out of the Old Testament delineations. And that subterfuge concedes a great deal. It admits the existence of the Messianic ideal fully and specifically formed in the Old Testament and held by the Jewish Church. And now Dr. Smith furnishes in a concluding lecture the proof that the historic Christ of Christianity, so far from identity with this formation by the Jewish mind from old prophecy, is quite a reverse character from that ideal, and is yet *the true fulfilment*. The Jewish national ambition had so distorted the prophetic ideal as to make it a fictitious character. Christianity brought out the ideal into a true reality. And nobody was more taken by surprise at this process than Christianity itself. Nothing can be more intuitively natural and true than the description of the conceptive change taking place in the apostolic minds while out of the false Jewish Messiahship the true Jesus Messiahship according to prophecy breaks upon the apostolic view.

Dr. Smith frankly, and with some dissatisfaction, admits that his work cannot treat one tenth part of the matter really at hand. His limits allow him only to show by a brilliant specimen what can be done. He is keenly logical, richly eloquent, learned and devout, dealing fearlessly and with polished sarcasm with the hanghtiest and latest skepticism; but, much and successfully as he achieves, he suggests far more. How little can he say of those rich topics, Moses, Ezekiel and Daniel. But the student, the theologian or the preacher, will find the whole prophetic field largely illuminated to his eye by studying first this work, then Fairbairn on Prophecy, and then Fairbairn's Typology.

Essay on Divorcè and Divorce Legislation. By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, LL.D., President of Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

The Christian Doctrine of Marriage. By HUGH DAVEY EVANS, LL.D. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1870.

There are numerous indications that the legislation of the United States in the matters of marriage and divorce is to be subjected to severe scrutiny. That legislation is in a confused and well-nigh chaotic condition. This confusion results naturally from the fact that such legislation is entrusted not to Congress but to the several State legislatures. Hence we have precisely the same codes in no two States. In South Carolina, until recently, no divorce was granted for any cause. In Indiana divorce is granted for every cause ever conceived by Jewish or American "hardness of heart." Hence it has often happened that the legal husband of one woman in a particular State has been the legal husband of another woman in a different State. People migrate to other States that they may be divorced on grounds not deemed admissible in the States where they reside. Hence it has become easy for any person who has grown weary of the matrimonial yoke to escape from its bondage. Public opinion is so far debauched that persons seek divorce for trifling causes without any great sense of wrong-doing or shame. Laxity is invading the Churches. The Catholics alone execute the New Testament rule in this matter. The members of other communions sometimes obtain divorces on grounds not sanctioned in the Bible, sometimes marry persons thus divorced; and ministers of these communions are often invited to solemnize such unscriptural unions. Some ministers marry these parties, while others refuse so to prostitute their office. Some ministers have even been married to persons who have been unscripturally divorced. The ecclesiastical bodies to which they are amenable have sometimes disciplined such ministers, and sometimes have not, the tendency being toward laxity. Examples of all the cases just enumerated have fallen under the personal notice of the present writer.

A condition of affairs so detrimental to civil and ecclesiastical prosperity has naturally aroused the attention of thoughtful men.

The book of President Woolsey is mainly an attempt to define the legislation of Christ on this subject. The first chapter discusses divorce among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. He shows that in the time of our Lord these nations had practically abolished the legal sanctity of marriage. They had long allowed separation on the most frivolous grounds. Hence, when Jesus

Christ said, "But I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery," he both condemned the existing practice of Jewish and pagan society, and re-affirmed the law of primal humanity as the marriage law of his Church. The author clearly shows that Christ allowed divorce solely for fornication. He proves plainly that the practice and the teachings of Paul were in harmony with the teachings of the Saviour. He demonstrates that the early Church understood the words of the Saviour and of St. Paul in this sense. He shows that the Catholic Church, through its tendency to exalt celibacy as a virtue of perfection, exaggerated the severity of the rule of Jesus; and that when the sacramental notion of marriage crept in divorce was not even allowed for the cause of adultery.

This Catholic exaggeration led to an undue reaction in the fathers of the Reformation. Divorce was granted by them for many causes not allowed in the word of God. This looser view of matrimonial obligations has led to the relaxed legislation of modern and Protestant nations. The law of the Church and of the State has been one wherever the National Church system has existed in full vigor.

It surely becomes all Churches of the Lord Jesus which are untrammelled by the State to make the rule of Christ their rule and the practice of the primitive Church their practice. Particularly should the American Churches make their legislation such that all their members, officers, and ministers shall know beyond all doubt whether any particular act is or is not a violation of the order and discipline of the bodies to which they belong. It is a question which we may fairly submit to our Bishops and to our next General Conference, whether some precise legislation should not require both our ministry and membership to obey the New Testament law on this subject, or be subjected to a stringent ecclesiastical discipline. President Woolsey's treatise will be a valuable aid in the formation of correct views in this matter. May it light all our Churches on their path to a more consistent practice.

The style of the book is solid and compact, its arrangement of topics excellent, and its mechanical execution creditable. Sometimes a bad sentence slips carelessly from the author's pen. He has several times over rendered the German word *Prozess* by the English "process," where it really means a lawsuit; and *pro-*

jet de loi and other like phrases are sometimes rendered too literally to convey their true meaning.

Mr. Evans's book shows learning, industry, and excellent printing; but it is heavy reading—one of those books, like Guicciardini's Wars of Pisa, rather than finish which one would willingly go to prison.

The Heavenly Father. Lectures on Modern Atheism. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, (Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences,) late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Geneva. Translated from the French by HENRY DOWNTON, M.A., English Chaplain at Geneva. 12mo., pp. 364. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1865.

Life Eternal. From the French of M. ERNEST NAVILLE, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Geneva. Translated by special permission. 12mo., pp. 253. London: W. H. Dalton. 1867.

Three courses of lectures were delivered by Ernest Naville at Geneva and at Lausanne, entitled respectively, *The Heavenly Father*, *The Life Eternal*, and *The Problem of Evil*. The first two have been translated into various languages—in English as above indicated. The third is translated by Professor Lacroix, of the Ohio Wesleyan University, with a sanction and a preface from the author, and will soon be issued by our own publishing house.

From a purely philosophical stand-point Naville asserts that God, Immortality, and Christianity possess imperative claims upon our belief. The Professor's chair sustains the divine authority of the Christian pulpit. "The author having few rivals on the Continent in the graces of polished eloquence," his public deliverances were attended by crowds and produced a very impressive effect. Their publication in different countries was demanded by the exigencies of the hour as a power in the great collision of moral forces now existing in Europe. The mind interested in the momentous topics discussed is borne along by the full current of a lucid, exuberant and rapid eloquence. Profound problems are discussed, not in condensed style or technical phrases intelligible to professionals alone, but in a series of luminous diffuse touches, taking even to a popular audience intelligent enough to be awakened to such high themes.

Naville's argument in the first volume shows historically that pure Theism was the first creed of the race and Polytheism the corruption: and that true Theism has been elucidated and reasserted to the reason of man by no other means than the Hebraic records, perfected by the teachings of Christ. He then pictures the moral chaos in the mind from which God is blotted out first in the individual, and then in society. For the human soul, both

individually and collectively, God is the key-stone that binds the faculties into unity and capacitates them for harmonious and perfect action. He then takes a broad survey of the influences of the "Revival of Atheism" in the mind of Europe. This is a saddening chapter. It seems as if religion were to be wrecked and man's higher nature be swallowed in a base animality. But no ! The Divine Pilot is on shipboard. The atheist's triumphal song, "Jehovah is dead," would, were it true, be indeed the requiem of our race. But the blessed hymn, "Christ is risen indeed," which can never be silenced, is the glorious anthem of our immortality. Naville next surveys the theories of modern Atheism, and exposes their contradictions, their tendencies, and their debasement. He then unfolds the argument for God from nature. Finally, he presses with great force and beauty the doctrine that God is not merely the Creator, but that creation is the offspring of Goodness, and that therefore God stands to us in the relation which the word Father feebly shadows. Brevity obliges him to give but the positive side of the argument for the paternal view ; the objections drawn from the dark facts of the world are reserved for answer in his *Problem of Evil*. The vigorous logician would often prefer a terser argument ; many difficulties are unmet, and many an argument unpressed. But the lectures flow in a stream of fresh and vigorous thought, abounding with fine passages and beautiful illustrations, apposite anecdotes, portraitures of character, and striking quotations both from opponents and supporters of the argument.

The volume on *Eternal Life* states the argument against Materialism, and then unfolds with great clearness the immeasurable superiority of Christianity over the most boasted rival systems, whether of classic philosophy or Buddhist religion, in presenting a worthy view of man's responsibility and immortality. Christianity is demonstrated to be the only religion for the human race.

One is struck throughout both volumes with the pure and noble spirit of the author. Candor in argument, kindness toward every opponent, however severe the reprobation of his degrading dogmas, a cheery elevation of spirit, and a glow of joyous piety winding off at the close of each volume in Christian triumph, leave an impression of light and happiness perfectly in contrast with the volumes of skepticism closing in darkness and gloom as to man's eternal destiny. A powerful realization remains that the dignity of our nature, the value of virtue, truth and

honor, the hopes of human progress, and the firm anticipation of immortality, are all bound up in the Gospel faith.

The "Revival of Atheism," heralded and prepared in its way by self-styled "radical Christianity," is struggling for a mighty demonstration in our own country. Doubtless it is to be met by the Church with a deeper self-consecration and the grasp of a still firmer faith upon the cross of Christ. So consecrated and so faithful we shall wage a fearless, though terrible battle, sure of victory through the blood of the Lamb. And part of the weaponry of that battle is the issue from our press of the master efforts of champions of the evangelical faith like Pressensé and Naville.

The Early Years of Christianity. By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D., Author of "Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work." Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD. THE APOSTOLIC ERA. 12mo., pp. 536. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The present is the first of four volumes, each complete in itself, yet following in series, in which Pressensé proposes to portray the history of the early Church. His *Life of Christ* was the prelude to this great work. His object is to checkmate the efforts of Renan and others who would clothe the results of negative and destructive criticism in the form of vivid narrative to fascinate the popular mind, by presenting a counter statement of the story which shall be sustainable by a thorough criticism and yet win the public attention. Church history has hitherto worn a very dry and repulsive aspect even to the professional student. Until Milman wrote it has been truly said that Gibbon was the only classic English Church historian. We imported Mosheim who furnished us with the substance of the matter, as solid as statistics and as arid. Neander gives us the spiritual life of the Church, yet in a lax and hazy style. But to Pressensé both French and English criticism have given the palm for making this, the garden of God, blossom as the rose. The young Church walks forth in the dew of her youth, with the light of heaven in her eye, and the bloom of morning on her cheek. By flinging the discussion of knotty problems into an appendix of critical notes, he leaves the body of his volume free for fresh-flowing narrative and pictorial statement. The pages of the work are, therefore, interesting alike to the critical student, the popular preacher, and the literary reader.

The full work is to embrace the great conflict of the Church with Paganism. In the present volume is contained the history of the Apostolic Age, commencing with the Pentecost and closing

with the close of St. John's career. It is a picture of the Christianity of the first century, with its expansions, its apostolic leaders, its growing institutes, its struggles with persecution, its forming of the canon, its doctrinal announcements, its heresies, its spiritual life. Based primarily upon the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles, illustrated by the most authentic documents of the age, and tested by the keenest criticism of our skeptical era, we have a work for our times. It is intrinsically one of the most momentous of histories. It embraces a period and a train of events pregnant with the destiny of ages then future, and of ages yet future. It opens up problems of the highest interest to the human soul.

The work is published from our press in a liberal spirit, rather for its rich evangelic tone than because it represents in all respects our own theology. It is published, indeed, with our *caveat* on that point. The theology of Pressensé is not Augustinian, nor Calvinistic, nor to the last shade Arminian; but may, perhaps, be called Melancthonian. He holds the European lax views of the Sabbath against which evangelical England and America protest. He has not the slightest doubt that immersion is the New Testament mode of baptism.

On the subject of the atonement his views are peculiar and may attract the attention of the evangelical Church. He does not adopt the Anselmian view of substitution. He does not hold that Christ suffered the penalty of the sinner's guilt as Damon might have suffered for Pythias's deed, by dying in his stead. His view is that as our representative Adam separated us from God by a great act of disobedience, so our representative Christ restores us to God by the highest act of obedience, even the suffering of death. Birth from Adam brings us under the headship of disobedient Adam; faith in Christ brings us under the headship of obedient Christ. Yet since *death* was the penalty for sin, so Christ, by suffering *death*, suffered that penalty for us. He became a *curse* for us, for cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. By this view of the matter he holds that all the texts of Scripture are fully satisfied and their true meaning completely expressed.

Pressensé denies a second imprisonment of Paul, holding the argument of Wieseler on that subject conclusive. He maintains the authenticity of all the canonical Epistles of Paul and that of Second Peter. He favors the theory that Apollos was the author of the Book of Hebrews, and maintains its rightful place in the canon. He defends St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse and gives a brief view of the import of that book.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Friedrich Rückert. Ein biographisches Denkmal. Von Dr. C. BEYER. Pp. xvi, 471. Frankfort-am-Main: J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag. 1868.

Since the death of Rückert in 1866 various monographs, critical sketches, and eulogistic *Erinnerungen* have been issued for the purpose of analyzing and interpreting his works, illustrating his character, or affectionately rehearsing the story of his life; but Dr. Beyer's volume is the first book that can make any claim to be called a biography of the German poet. The calm and comparatively uneventful course of Rückert's external life is described with rather more fullness, we think, than the meager materials would justify. His lineage, nativity, childhood, and all the associations and influences that may possibly have stimulated the boy's imagination or contributed to the formation of his mind and character; the natural scenery, myths and romantic legends of Oberlauringen, where his youth was spent; the peculiarities of the village people with whom he came in contact, as well as the prominent features of the country and population for ten miles about, are dwelt upon with that fondness for minute details which so often swells a German biography into a combination of local guide-book and contemporary history, and exhausts not only the subject, but also the reader's patience. The sentimental experiences and misplaced attachments of the youth are all conscientiously related—his Arcadian dreams and successive affections to Aunel, and Agnes, and even the innkeeper's daughter, "*Amaryllis formosissima*," to whom he addressed innumerable love poems full of classical allusions to "Olympian gods" and "Thessalian sorceresses," of which the naive and rosy-cheeked beer-maiden had no more definite idea than the Dublin fish-woman had of "parallelopipedon," as an epithet of abuse or a term of endearment. The account which is given of Rückert's juvenile poems and prose compositions presents no points of special interest except the remarkable facility in the use of the Latin language which these productions of a school-boy of fifteen years exhibit. The poem quoted on page 28 as "the oldest monument" of his muse is certainly very finished and elegant; not even the most brilliant *Primaner* of a German gymnasium could be expected to compose such polished verses. Our only surprise is that neither Dr. Beyer nor Professor Heinrich Rückert, in whose possession the original manuscript is said to be, should have recognized the stanzas as Ovid's.

In the autumn of 1805 he began the study of law at the University.
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXII.—39

versity of Würzburg, in obedience to his father's wishes. But this profession was to him one of the driest of bread and butter sciences, and he turned for relief to philology and belles lettres. At the same time he became deeply interested in Wagner's system of idealism, a philosophy which he afterward characterized as "a chaotic medley of unripe empiricism and unripe speculation." The fruits of his philological researches were subsequently embodied in a dissertation on the idea of philology, (*Dissertatio philologico-philosophica de idea Philologiae*, as the title runs,) which he defended before the Faculty of Jena in 1811, as he entered upon the duties of *Privatdocent* in that University. Notwithstanding the excess of metaphysical subtlety in this inaugural dissertation, it presents a more philosophic and cosmopolitan view of linguistic science than Eichstädt, Gabler, and the other academic periwigs of that day had as yet had any presentiment of. His discussion of root words is acute but unsatisfactory. The vowels, he says, are the real, the consonants the ideal parts of language; the vowels are the body, the consonants the soul; the vowels represent feeling and femininity, the consonants represent intelligence and masculinity; all vowels are derived from *e*, all consonants from *h*. From a combination of these letters, *eh*, he deduces a series of radical words, such as *Ehe*, matrimony, (*et matrimonium a deo institutum est, quia ehe est eh divinum, quod in humanitatem descendit*.) *Ich*, denoting personality, etc. The author himself seems to have had an inkling of the fantastic absurdity of his etymologies, as he closes this portion of his essay with a timely warning against any manifestations of convulsive merriment on the part of the reader—*Absit risus profanorum!* Even his statement of the relations of vowels to consonants is entirely incorrect. Grimm and Ewald have shown conclusively that the more intellectual and spiritual qualities of language depend upon the light and flexible vowel, whereas the more material qualities inhere in the sturdy and long consonant; the consonants determine the form of the word, the vowels determine its function; the consonants furnish the substance which the vowels light up and define.

But it would be unjust to make these etymological quiddities the measure of Rückert's philological ability. His genius for linguistic studies, which has been characterized by one of his friends as "something incomprehensible and almost demoniacal," was not more remarkable than the intense and untiring energy with which he pursued them. Few pedagogues, even of the most

inveterate type, have ever labored with the "iron industry" of Rückert during the six years (1820-1826) which he spent as *Privatgelehrter* at Coburg, and again during the last eighteen years of his life, (1848-1866,) which he devoted chiefly to Oriental literature. Extended studies of Homer, various translations of Greek tragedies and comedies, complete translations of Theocritus and Horace, with numerous annotations in which the laws of meter and rhythm are especially discussed, critical emendations and poetic elaborations of the Minnesingers, whose songs he regarded as superior to the lyrics of Alcæus and Anacreon, and inferior only to those of Goethe, are a few of the fruits of his scholarly labors during these two periods. Still it was to Persian, Arabic, and Sanscrit that he directed his principal energies, and showed not only in his *Hariri* but also in many other poems,

"Wie Poesie und Philologie einander zu fördern
Und zu ergänzen vermag."

In his efforts to make poesy and philology thus mutually promote and supplement each other, Rückert enriched German literature with the most varied and graceful forms of versification and rhyme. From the Arabian *Hariri* he borrowed the *makame*, in which meter he relates the adventures and metamorphoses of Abu Seid of Serug; from the Persian *Dschelaleddiar* he took the *ghasel*, a poem standing between the epigram and the lyric, and consisting of an indefinite number of couplets, of which the two lines composing the first couplet rhyme with the last line of all the subsequent couplets, the fundamental tone or trait being, according to Platen, "ein schelmisches Getändel," a genial flattery or waggish diletteism. In "Nal und Damajanti" (an episode of the great epos, the *Mahabharata*) he introduced the Sanscrit *sloka* and successfully engrafted this scion of the Banyan forest upon the Hercynian oak; in "Rostem und Suhrab" and "Weisheit des Brahmanen" he naturalized the Alexandrine; in "Edelstein und Perle," and "Flor und Blankflor" he gave admirable specimens of the iambic tiercet, and in other poems he made nearly every form of Oriental and Occidental versification (even the peculiar measure of the Chinese *Tshi-kin*) familiar to the German ear. In these respects there is no poet of modern times so rich and many-sided as Rückert. But this affluence and facility brought their own perils with them. It cannot be denied, even by his most enthusiastic admirers, that many of his productions are exceedingly feeble in conception and commonplace in thought, and hardly worthy of a third-rate poetaster. A man who gives expression to all his ideas and emotions in rhyme will

inevitably be the author of a multitude of effusions which look like poetry at a distance, but on closer examination prove to be unilluminated by the faintest spark of inspiration. This was pre-eminently the fatality of Rückert. As he says of himself,

"Mehr als Blumen im Gefilde sprossen
Lieder täglich unter meiner Feder."

Every event of his external or internal life, every impression, whether derived from observation or from study, touched the chords of his soul as musically as the breeze touches the Æolian harp, and transformed itself into song. Too frequently, also, the results resembled the tones of an Æolian harp in being melodious and empty sounds and nothing more.

"Darum muss der Reim sie ketten,
Weil sie sonst kein Wesen hätten,
Würde nicht der Schein es retten,"

is Rückert's own apology for his rhymed platitudes.

Notwithstanding the vigor and fire of Rückert's patriotic songs, and the imperishable charm of a portion of the "*Liebesfrühling*," we cannot agree with Dr. Beyer in according to him the character of a "*Lyriker im vollsten sinne des Wortes*." His genius is pre-eminently didactic, if genius can be regarded as at all essential to, or consistent with, the cultivation of this species of poetry. This inborn tendency to speculation, intensified by the powerful influence which Hegelianism exerted upon all provinces of thought during the third and fourth decades of the present century, shows itself in all Rückert's writings and culminates in his "*Wisdom of the Brahman*," a poem consisting of a series of slightly connected monologues in which the most prominent schools of philosophy and systems of theosophy that have prevailed among different nations in different centuries are interpreted and criticized. The same element of reflection and instruction enters so largely into his dramas as to deprive them of every thing like dramatic unity and development and reduce them to a mere philosophy of history in dialogue, or, as regards the artistic form, to a sort of literary oratorio, so predominant is the musical expression in them. In like manner his epics are legendary and idyllic rather than truly objective and heroic, and seem to exist less in and for themselves than for the sake of inculcating moral truths or unfolding philosophic principles. In fact, the pedagogue is prominent in all his productions, and in very many of them entirely overshadows the poet. From this point of view Dr. Beyer is certainly justified in claiming

for Rükert the title of *Proceptor Germaniæ* in a broader sense than it can be applied to any other German author or teacher, not excepting Melancthon.

Geschichte der Kirchlichen Armenpflege. (History of Ecclesiastical Charity.) Von GEORGE RATZINGER. 8vo., pp. xiv., 433. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. 1868.

The ministrations of the Roman Catholic Church to the needy in all ages have received the highest encomiums of Protestants and political economists, and the author of this work, who is one of that body, renders a general service in portraying fully, and, we believe, impartially, the history of the charitable ministrations of his Church. He does not rely merely upon his co-religionists for authority, but has recourse to any that can furnish him support or light in his inquiries. Neander and Chalmers mix in friendly intercourse with Hefele, Döllinger, and Dupanloup, while our American Carey is allowed to expound his Protectionism.

The Romans, with all their culture, paid no attention whatever to the needy. In all pagan countries man, as such, had no rights except those which the bare letter of the law gave him, so that whole classes were really deprived of all claim upon the consideration of their fellow-men. The idea of *manhood* was totally wanting in heathendom, and even the noblest minds of antiquity were never able to attain to the pure ideas of humanity. We do not find them arrayed against the crimes of slavery, murder, or infanticide. There was no heart, no feeling for the sufferings of others. The maxim of Plautus expresses the heartlessness of all rich Romans: "He who gives food or drink to the beggar gets but little thanks; for he not only loses what he gives, but prolongs the poor man's wretched life." The whole Roman kingdom possessed no elements on which it was possible to build a care or love for the needy, for the Roman religion itself was the very fountain of immorality and human hatred. Domestic life was utterly corrupt, and destitute of love and feeling, and this was the cause of the general neglect of the poor. When Christianity came, a new element was added to the life and thinking of the world. Slavery was at that time every-where predominant, and no Roman was regarded respectable who was not a slave-holder. Now, Christianity addressed itself at once to all these social abuses; but it found slavery the hardest evil to eradicate. Many of the Church Fathers wrote directly against it. Chrysostom demanded of all slave-holders in the Christian Church to retain but two for personal service in the household, and to give all the rest which

they might own the privilege of learning a trade and living from it in later life. He indulged the secret thought of transforming slavery into a system of free manual labor, and thus gradually bringing all the slaves out of their bonds. The Gallic bishops required all slave-holders to release one of every ten from bondage. Even Gregory the Great wrote the noble sentiment: "It is a saving thought to restore their original freedom to men whom nature has made free, and whom man has deprived of their rights, and burdened them with the yoke of slavery." The efforts for the alleviation and extirpation of slavery met with inveterate opposition in England, perhaps even greater than anywhere else. Though the Council of London prohibited, A. D. 1112, the traffic in slaves, its decrees proved futile. Unscrupulous poor parents still sold their children to Ireland, and so extensive was the trade that in 1171 the Irish Synod of Armagh prohibited the buying and selling of English children, and declared that all English slaves in Ireland were free.

During the period down to the Reformation a multitude of institutions was organized for the relief of the needy. But a long time of inactivity now succeeded, and it was only at the beginning of the nineteenth century that charity again increased, and now gives evidence of approaching the early Christian example. All the German countries have introduced the English system of committing the poor largely to the care of the State—a system which, says the author, is fraught with evil to the State and neglect to the needy. We think that Protestants might gain some good ideas from the principles which Dr. Ratzinger lays down for the observance of all Catholics in the distribution of their charity. That each parish take special care of its own poor; that the pastor superintend the distribution of the poor fund; that religious pastoral care be always associated with the distribution of alms; that there always be unity in almsgiving, but wise distribution of labor; that all classes of the parish poor be supported; that charity be bestowed in necessary articles, such as clothing, implements for work, etc.; that, in bestowing alms, heed must be taken lest the self-respect of the beneficiaries be destroyed.

In giving this abstract of the work, we have already intimated its outline, which is as follows: Introduction, Part I., Christian Antiquity: 1. The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age; 2. The Age of Persecutions; 3. The Patristic Age. Part II., The Middle Ages: 1. The Carolingian Age; 2. From the Carolingians

to the Hohenstaufens; 3. From the Hohenstaufens to the Reformation. Part III, The New Period: 1. The Church and Charity; 2. Civil Charity; 3. Organization of Ecclesiastical Charity in the Future. Dr. Ratzinger leaves the Protestant Church altogether out of consideration, though he confesses the great service which Protestantism has rendered in this direction. He especially commends the great institutions of Dr. Wichern, of the Rough House, near Hamburgh, and promises to treat Protestant charity in a separate work at an early date. We shall await with interest the fulfillment of his promise.

Gott, Welt, und Mensch. Grundlinien der Religionswissenschaft in ihrer neuen Stellung und Gestaltung systematisch dargelegt. (God, the World, and Man. Outlines of the Science of Religion in its new Position and Form, Systematically Expounded.) Von EDWARD BALTZER. 8vo., pp. viii, 504. Nordhausen: F. Förstemann. 1869.

The author is one of the veteran leaders of the Free Congregations of Germany, that class of religious organizations which began in 1841 by casting off the doctrines sanctioned by the symbolical books, by cutting loose from the supervision and guidance of the State Church, and establishing their own rites, doctrines, and ecclesiastical polity. The members call themselves Protestant Friends, but received from their enemies the *sobriquet* of Friends of Light. Pastor Baltzer, in this last fruit of his prolific pen, adheres faithfully to the principles which he advocated twenty-five years ago, for he contends as fearlessly as ever for perfect religious liberty, and for the overthrow of all confessional restraint and ecclesiastical discipline. His work is divided as follows: Introduction. I. The Doctrine of the Beautiful. II. The Doctrine of the View of the World. III. The Doctrine of Self-Knowledge. IV. The Doctrine of Morals. V. The Doctrine of Art. VI. The Doctrine of Labor. The section on labor abounds in facts which would be of interest to general readers in England and America, where the discussions on society, and especially the laboring classes, have become so animated of late. The present age is a time of contradictions, the author contends, and many are asking, What is religion? but without receiving a satisfactory reply. The individual may appeal to his conscience, and yet his conscience may err. Now, he should purify and sharpen his *conscientiousness*, and this he can only do by science, by a perception of the truth. Materialism, however, must not be understood as a science. Religion does not consist in the feeling, with Schleiermacher, nor in idea, nor in knowledge, nor in desire, nor in capa

city, nor in devotion, nor in history, nor in the past, nor in the present, *but in the deed, in doing something*. But the religious element must have free scope, and hence Church government must be cast to the winds, for it contradicts the very essence of the religion of Jesus, and assumes Papal power, therefore being political, and not religious. One of the great problems of the times is the development of the science of religion, which is not one science among others, but that which embraces all else, every thing that deserves the name of science. All material for the science of religion falls under six points of view :

- I. *Feeling*—Esthetics, the Doctrine of the Beautiful.
- II. *Notion*—Dogmatics, the Doctrine of the View of the World.
- III. *Thinking*—Philosophy, the Doctrine of Self-Knowledge.
- IV. *The Will*—Ethics, the Doctrine of Morals.
- V. *Power*—Artistics, the Doctrine of Art.
- VI. *Doing*—Biology, the Doctrine of Labor.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection. A Series of Essays. By ALFRED WALLACE, Author of "The Malay Archipelago," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 384. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1870.

The "contributions to the theory" thus modestly offered were, some of them, published by Mr. Wallace in a scientific periodical before the theory itself had been given by Mr. Darwin to the world. Mr. Wallace, as we have stated in a former Quarterly, had in some degree anticipated Darwin, and his independent incursions into the field startled the great theorist into a premature publication. Yet in the present volume Mr. Wallace is particularly delicate to disclaim more than his own due, and is jealous lest a single fiber of Darwin's laurels should perchance seem to bind his own brow. In this volume, as in his "Malay Archipelago," lately by us reviewed, Mr. Wallace impresses us with his eminently conscientious candor.

A large share of the book is devoted to the curious subject of protective resemblances in the animal world. A species of beetle may so resemble the bark of the tree on which it holds its residence that it escapes destruction by its invisibility. Large numbers of animal species survive and permanently exist by this deceptive protection. Tristram, in his work on the ornithology of North Africa, is quoted as saying: "In the desert, where neither trees, brush-wood, nor even undulation of the surface afford the slight-

est protection from its foes, a modification of color which shall be assimilated to that of the surrounding country is absolutely necessary. Hence, *without exception*, the upper plumage of *every bird*, whether lark, chat, sylvain, or sand-grouse, and also the fur of *all the smaller mammals*, and the skin of *all the snakes and lizards*, is of one uniform Isabeline or sand color."—P. 50. The inference is that every species wanting this protection has perished, and we have a demonstration, it is argued, of Natural Selection, or the "survival of the fittest." Mr. Wallace traces this interesting subject through a great variety of resemblance in various parts of the world. It leaves the impression that, in a great number of instances, species do permanently exist by favor of special conditions; a conclusion probable and curious enough in itself, and very corroborative in its effect; but falling short, perhaps, of universality of application.

In his "Theory of Birds' Nests," Mr. Wallace maintains that birds build no more by mere instinct than man does. He assumes to prove that birds even learn to sing their particular notes, not from the inward promptings and shapings of the vocality, but from imitation of the parent note. Birds sing the song they are first habituated to hear; and if it be the tune of some other species, then their form will belong to one kind and their song to another! In a similar way birds *learn* to build. The same species build with different materials and in a different manner under different conditions. They improve in their style of building. On the other hand man builds also by imitation, according to necessities and conditions. On the whole, according to Mr. Wallace, the bird mind and the human mind differ not in the nature but in the range of their faculties. There is much to which we incline to demur in this ingenious chapter.

Mr. Wallace next gives an extended reply to the Duke of Argyll's argument in behalf of creation by Omnipotence in accordance with Law. He states the six Darwinian laws, (which are, indeed, but the simple statement of well-known facts,) which we may give as follows: *First*, All species tend to increase by propagation in a geometrical ratio; yet, *Second*, each species is in fact so limited by immense destructions as to remain stationary in actual number. *Third*, each species tends to produce its own likeness; yet, *Fourth*, this likeness always admits of a degree, more or less, of individual variation. *Fifth*, when a variation is disadvantageous, the individual or species perishes in the struggle for existence, and leaves none but the best adapted for survival.

Sixth, geological changes are constantly introducing new conditions, and so both destroying old species and tending to increase the amount of variation. Thus by a few well-ascertained permanent *facts*, formulated into *laws*, Mr. Wallace thinks that all the varieties of life are solved, and many facts are found which no other theory will explain. These six laws are indeed not primitive. Back of them you might assign a divine Law-giver. But, as he thinks, Herbert Spencer has shown in his "First Principles" and his "Biology" that all these so-called Laws may be but the simple necessary "results of the very nature of life, and of the essential properties of organized and unorganized matter."

I believe that the universe is so constituted as to be self-regulating; that, as long as it contains life, the forms under which that life is manifested have an inherent power of adjustment to each other and to surrounding nature; and that this adjustment necessarily leads to the greatest amount of variety and beauty and enjoyment, because it does depend on general laws and not on a continual supervision and re-arrangement of details. As a matter of feeling and religion, I hold this to be a far higher conception of the Creator and of the Universe than that which may be called the "continual interference" hypothesis; but it is not a question to be decided by our feelings or convictions, it is a question of facts and of reason. Could the change which Geology shows us has ever taken place in the forms of life have been produced by general laws, or does it imperatively require the incessant supervision of a creative mind?—P. 268.

Mr. Wallace, like most reasoners of his class, is very anxious to save trouble to the Infinite. God, in his view, may be able to take care of large things, but cannot afford to notice small things. He might, perhaps, be allowed to regulate the orrery of the universe revealed to us by the telescope, but not the infinite littleness suggested by the microscope. We are not told how big an article must be in order to be visible to Omniscience. We are not told how much nearer to infinity a planet is than an animalcule. Such a reasoner seems not to realize that under color of honoring he is truly degrading the Deity. God is absolutely perfect in the infinitely little as in the infinitely great; equally wonderful in both universes. Under color of excusing God from trouble, such reasoners ever first excuse God from all care for the universe, and then from all existence in it. It is the first pious and respectful step toward Atheism.

Yet man, Mr. Wallace maintains, has by the power of reason risen largely above the power of external conditions, and so *above the law of Natural Selection*. An animal or species overtaken with a slight defect perishes in the struggle for existence. But man by protective inventions and by mutual social aids defies to a great degree the consequences of special disadvantages. In the

geologic ages, before man had attained under special favorable conditions the powers of reason, though probably possessed of nearly his present form, he was developed into the different races in which he now is found. A specialization into races cannot take place after the fully rational period has commenced, and man has become able to resist the specializing influences.

But in man Mr. Wallace also discovers original characteristics for which Natural Selection cannot account, and which bear the marks of Overruling Design. He goes through a striking demonstration to show that savage man has a larger brain than Natural Selection can allow, requiring a primitive endowment. So the hairless skin, the peculiarities of the human hand, and the powerful moral intuitions which Mr. Wallace's ample experience among uncivilized races has enabled him there to trace, are all traits above the power of Mr. Darwin's theory to explain. In man, then, Mr. Wallace recognizes specialty, supremacy, and overruling purpose. After such concessions, what becomes of the outcry against "special creation?" Why not have done with it, and allow man, in the noble language of the primitive document, to have been "created in the image of God?"

Mr. Wallace revolts, too, quite erectly, against the Atheistic conclusions with which second-rate reasoners have endeavored to overlay Darwin. He revolts, too, against Mr. Huxley's "protoplasmic" materialism. Matter, moreover, he believes not to be constituted of ultimate particles. What have generally been considered to be "atoms," he holds to be infinitely minute "centers of force;" so that all matter is *force*; and of this *force* the cause and basis are the divine volition; so that in the entire system and movement of things the divine will is immanent. If so, then, we think each "center of force" is a "special creation;" and so is each "variation in species," and so is every definite form of species. Every movement of every ultimate "center of force" requires a movement of divine volition. Instead of being "self-regulating," "the universe" is regulated at each infinitesimal step; and that "inherent power of self-adjustment" is the immanent God adjusting every part and particle. God ceases to be that infinitely lazy Turpitude which the savans would make of him, and is ever working with equal wonderfulness in the infinitely great and throughout the infinitely minute. Doubtless, an infinite and eternal Being would persistently act with a free uniformity according to the Law of wisdom. And it is that uniformity which unwise men use to abolish God and establish Atheism.

Miracles Past and Present. By WILLIAM MOUNTFORD. 12mo., pp. 512. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1870.

Critics who represent Mr. Mountford's work as merely an appropriation of modern so-called "Spiritualism" to the uses of a supernatural philosophy and religion, misstate the scope of his arguments. There are but two or three chapters treating of the Spiritualistic phenomena, and those might be cut out of his book without materially affecting its results. His position, more extendedly, is, that there is a large body of supernatural narrative, too well authenticated by rational evidence to be rationally rejected. He agrees with Henry More, Wesley, Dr. Bushnell, and others, that supernatural manifestations, the projection of superhuman agencies into our human sphere, so far from being, in accordance with Hume, *contrary to experience*, are verified by thousands of recorded and constantly occurring experiences. It is a most vicious circle to maintain that supernaturalism is contrary to experience by rejecting every experience that is a supernaturalism. Nor is it just or logical to say, that if you admit the truth of any modern narrative of the supernatural you must admit the whole body of superstitious marvels; for all history and all narrative must be tested by a discriminating criticism, eliminating fiction from truth; and when these narratives are so tested, there is an immense residuum which is rejected not by the fair reason, but by the persistent *will* of the skeptic. Mr. Mountford maintains that Protestant theologians, compelled, as they fancied, to reject the miracles of Popery, have fearfully played into the hands of infidelity by so strenuously denying the validity of evidence as to shake the credibility of the Scripture miracles; but to the Papist he would reply by admitting any duly authenticated Catholic supernaturalism, and then showing quite as good and quite as numerous miracles among Protestants. Sporadic supernaturalisms, in countless numbers, occurred among the pagans. They are occurring every day, among the religious and the irreligious, in the form of dreams, second sight, presentiments, etc., sometimes carefully concealed in silence for fear of ridicule, sometimes circumstantially narrated in our secular newspapers.

How then can miracles be specially adduced in favor of Christianity? We are not quite sure that we coincide with Mr. Mountford in our answer to this question. His chapter on the definition of a miracle, we think, runs astray. He gives the term miracle, as is often done, to *all* supernaturalisms, whereas we

would limit the term in a strict sense to a particular kind, namely, to a *supernaturalism visibly originated and performed at the will of a visible agent in attestation of a religious truth, system, or mission*. A supernaturalism, like a dream or a presentiment, *coming upon* a man from an unseen source, rather than performed voluntarily by him, is no miracle. Miracles, therefore, are in fact mostly limited to Scripture history. Moses performed one miracle of larger physical magnitude than any one performed by Christ; but his miracles were specifically limited and prescribed to him. *Christ alone appears to be full master of all miraculous power at will*. He stands alone in the attitude of claiming and wielding at pleasure any power he pleases in proof of his supreme identification with God himself. The human system, the elements, the gates of death and hades, nay, the powers of hell, submit to his sway and volition. He stands, therefore, without a rival; and when we superadd the identification of his divine person by antecedent prophecy, the majesty of his Personality as it presents itself in the Gospel picture, and the wonderful effects of his life on human history, it is absurd to bring any supernaturalism, however clear its reality, into competition with his divine supremacy. Quite the reverse. Every other visible manifestation of the supernatural serves to remove the presupposition against miracle, and especially against the supreme miracle of Christ claiming to be God-man.

Many Protestant theologians deny all modern or extra-scriptural supernaturalism, not only from fear of Papal miracles, but because their views of "an intermediate state" are in danger of being contradicted. Those who deny an intermediate state can scarce admit a message from a disembodied spirit. Others fear a contradiction to their particular views of the conditions of the intermediate state. We entertain neither of these fears. That there is an intermediate state, that there may occur conditions under which a spirit in that state may make communications, true or false, to a living individual possessing the proper predisposition, is to our view uncontradicted by Scripture. Nor have we met with any tolerably authenticated narrative of the kind that at all disturbed our theology.

The inquirer into this subject will find many a solution of old difficulties in Mr. Mountford's work, expressed in a very pleasant style. There are, indeed, some waste paragraphs and chapters. His Unitarian theology prevents his placing Christ in his full, sole, Divine Majesty, and so weakens his argument. To those predisposed to his views his book will be an acceptable sup-

plement to Jung Stilling's Theory of Pneumatology, with its mixture of truth and error; to Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology, and to Mr. M'Donald's book on Spiritualism, published at our Book Rooms.

Maternity. A popular Treatise for Wives and Mothers. By TULLIO SUZZARDI VERDI, of Washington, D.C. 12mo., pp. 451. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 1870.

No creature is brought up in so studied an ignorance to the last moment of the duties of its futurity as the young girl destined to be a mother. Our wonder is not that so many human beings die in infancy, but that the human race has survived. Civilization, however, has arrived at that point in which one remedy is attainable. A manual furnished by a competent professional hand can be put in her possession as soon as she becomes a wife. Anxieties, fearful mistakes, and remediless disasters may be prevented by such a method. The present volume comes from an eminent homeopathic *savant*, and is doubtless clothed with professional authority.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Our Oriental Missions. Volume I. India and China. Volume II. China and Bulgaria. By EDWARD THOMSON, D.D., LL.D., Late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. Pp. 267, 281. Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden. New York: Carlton and Lanahan. 1870.

With the utmost modesty Bishop Thomson claims in the preface of these volumes to furnish only "substantially a Journal," kept by him during his visit to the East in the years 1864-65 with the view of a suitable report to the Church of the condition of its Oriental mission work. Had he been premonished of his departure to be with Christ, and had he sought with the greatest care for words which, as the charge of a dying Christian Bishop, should point out the way of both duty and victory, and so live long after he had gone, he could hardly have found any better adapted to inspire the Church to arise and possess the world for its Lord than are contained in some of these chapters.

A mere record of travel in those lands, now so full of a daily increasing interest, prepared by so keen an observer, would have been of great value, just as it would have been a rare privilege, with him as a companion, to look upon the wonderful beauty of the Taj Mahal, to explore the temples and shrines of holy Benares, to sit and think of Chrysostom in St. Sophia, or ride by railway into Ephesus. Nothing worth seeing escapes his eyes, and terse sentences comprise the wealth of an ordinary page. Indeed, one

sometimes wishes for a greater fullness of description, until it becomes apparent that the author only hastens on to grander fields and higher themes. He went abroad upon the duty of examining the several mission fields of his own Church. This duty he fulfilled thoroughly and conscientiously, visiting every station and personally observing its condition. Facts as he found them are detailed briefly but sufficiently. The address given to the missionaries at the time of the organization of the India Mission Conference, while full of sympathy for the little band, and eloquent beyond the speech that often falls upon human ears, shows him to have mastered the whole problem of religion in India. He could not conceive his duty to be done without an exhibition of the relation of Christianity to the religious systems and the entire round of circumstances in that country, and to this we are indebted for the chapters entitled "General Remarks on India," and "Our Field in India," than which it is doubtful if a more brilliant and comprehensive presentation of the subject has ever been made. Though the latter is limited in its application, no friend of missions can examine either of them without delight.

In the same way the field in China was explored, its peculiarities described, its religious systems examined and found ready to perish, and the advantages of the country for missionary work are presented in an essay of some twenty pages. Then we have the return journey to Constantinople and a visit to the missions in Turkey, but details respecting them give place to the graver inquiries which arise in the presence of the Christianity of Western Asia and Eastern Europe. The Greek, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Abyssinian, Maronite and Nestorian Churches, fallen but nevertheless Christian, still firmly hold the essential doctrines of the Gospel, though combining with them a literature and practice unfavorable to spiritual life. The facts thus furnished are essential to a full apprehension of the relation of Christianity to the greater field of the whole world, to the consideration of which the reader is next invited. The comparison of Christianity with Mohammedism, Brahminism, and Buddhism, the religions of 630,000,000 of souls, in the respects of civilization, theology, morals, and salvation, full as is its truth and profound as is its thought, is only preparative to a view of the condition and prospects of the Church of Christ. It is no less true than startling to those whose investigations have not been directed toward it, that Christianity numbers more believers than any other faith, controls thirty forty-ninths of the earth's surface,

and has under its scepter politically more than one half of the race. The intelligence, the wealth, and the power of the globe are in Christian hands. There is also an increasing disposition to propagate the faith, and with it increased facilities, so that, using the means at its command, the Church should look for the conversion of the world before the close of the twentieth century.

Our outline can convey no idea of the clear thought, careful analysis, deep penetration, and beautiful style of these volumes. They are unsurpassed in our missionary literature. They breathe throughout the spirit of the loftiest faith in the coming triumph of the Church—the spirit which, when it once prevades its mighty hosts, will render them irresistible and bring near the promised day of victory.

D. A. W.

Round the World: A Series of Letters by CALVIN KINGSLEY, D.D., late Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Vol. I., Europe and America. Vol. II., Asia. 12mo, pp. 344, 325. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan.

The stalwart figure, dark eye, and mellow voice of Bishop Kingsley will not soon fade from the memory of the Church. His was a most manly Christian life. His history leaves some memorable points. He was, like Asbury, a pioneer Bishop; not a pioneer over solely the American soil, but an episcopal pioneer "around the world." He has erected his memento on the soil of Asia; a token that Asia is to be conquered to Christ. And these two beautiful volumes will be as seed sown in the heart of the Church to bring forth manifold fruits.

Bishop Kingsley's style is like his character—clear, vigorous, solid, realistic. His pages are not variegated with the hues of fancy. There is little of rhetorical rhythm in his periods. His record around the world stands in curious contrast with the pages of the sensational traveler who must make every clause of every sentence flashing and thrilling lest his book fail to fix the reader and so to gain the purchaser. He assumes a practical and rational interest on the part of his reader, and repays it with truth. We hope that thousands will travel with him over his route around the globe, and that the light his career has thrown over the field of the world will bring it more clearly under the eye of the Church, and contribute to the formation of a new era in our missionary work.

We are specially interested with his survey of the two great Asiatic fields, China and India. The effect on his own mind was evidently a practical increase of his faith in Christianity. His

descriptions of the utter debasement of the people, especially in the Chinese cities, is at once humorous and appalling. For that degradation the Gospel is the true and surely coming remedy. The Chinese, he says, are

An ignorant people compared with Protestant Christian nations, and a degraded people; yet they esteem all but themselves barbarians. But it is characteristic of poor human nature to assume to possess in extraordinary measure the very thing it lacks. If the Gospel can bring this people to a level with Christian civilization, and should make no more difference in their favor in the world to come than it does in this world, there will be motives strong enough to urge the entire Christian Church in earnest Christian effort in their behalf.

The Asiatic superstitions, he finds, are in themselves fading away:

It is easy to see that both Hindoo idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindoos, with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rights, who, nevertheless, told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. I speak now of many of the more intelligent among them. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the sacred Ganges will lose its virtue. The day is dawning on India. May the Sun of Righteousness, with healing in his beams, soon rise upon her!

Christianity in its entire spirit is more happy than heathenism:

Without witnessing it, one cannot realize what a difference there is in the entire mental and moral atmosphere between a heathen and a Christian country. While one is bright, and cheerful, and hopeful, and warm, and enterprising, the other is dark, and dreary, and cold, and stagnant, and desponding. It revives the spirits, and gives new vigor and life to the whole man to return and see how Christianity moves the world; to feel its warm sympathy and breathe its heavenly atmosphere.

Free Russia. By HEPWORTH DIXON, Author of "Free America," "Her Majesty's Tower," etc. 12mo., pp. 359. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Were Hepworth Dixon as reliable as he is readable, his book would be a valuable contribution to our political literature. But his "Free Russia" is but too suitable a companion to his "Free America," basing large pretensions of knowledge upon very slight observation, and substituting the sensational for the accurate. The present work is precisely what one might expect from a tourist who could report to Europe that our Shaker settlements exert a large influence on the public mind of the United States.

The following paragraph, however, is, we fear, but too accurate; and it furnishes to our own sensational classes a fair warning of the probable results of the enormous prevalence of fashionable

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXII.—40

card-playing among ourselves. Let but the *amusement* get full establishment, and the *gambling* will duly follow :

Next to rye bread and salt-fish, saints and cards are the articles mostly bought and sold, for in Russia every body prays and plays: the noble in his club, the dealer at his shop, the boatman on his barge, the pilgrim by his way-side cross. The propensities to pray and gamble may be traced to a common root; a kind of moral *fetichism*, a trust in the grace of things unseen, in the merit of dead men, and even in the power of chance. A Russian takes, like a child, to every strange thing, and prides himself on the completeness of his faith. When he is not kneeling to his angel, nothing renders him so happy as the sight of a pack of cards. Nearly every one plays high for his means; and nothing is more common than for a burgher to stake and lose, first his money, then his boots, his cap, his *caftan*, every scrap of his garments, down to his very shirt. Whisky excepted, nothing drives a Russian to the devil so quickly as a pack of cards. But see these gamblers throw down their cards, unbonnet their heads, and fall upon their knees. The priest is coming down the street with his sacred picture and his cross. It is market-day in the town, and he is going to open and bless some shop in the bazar; and fellows who were gambling for their shirts are now upon their knees in prayer.—Page 219.

The Prescott Memorial; or, a Genealogical Memoir of the Prescott Families in America. In two parts. By WILLIAM PRESCOTT, M.D. Green and gilt, 8vo., pp. 653. Boston: Dutton & Son. 1870.

The venerable Dr. Prescott of Concord, the honored friend of the late Dr. Wilbur Fisk, and founder of the "Prescott Cabinet," at the Wesleyan University, is here the memorialist of the Prescott families of America. Besides the frontispiece likeness of the author there are several other fine engravings, including that of the eminently intellectual face of the celebrated historian. It is a beautiful volume externally; every way a worthy memento of the extensive *gens* of Prescotts.

The Rob Roy on the Jordan, Nile, Red Sea, and Genesareth, etc. A Canoe Cruise in Palestine and Egypt, and the Waters of Damascus. By J. MACGREGOR, M.A. With Maps and Illustrations.

Mr. Macgregor tells his story, first for Harper's Monthly, in the style of a rover, sensationallly and graphically. But he writes also with the knowledge of a scholar and in the faith of a Christian. It is a book which the popular reader may run over with interest, and the biblical student consult for new information.

Educational.

A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language, in which its Forms are illustrated by those of Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Friesic, Old Norse, and Old High German. By FRANCIS A. MARCH, Professor of the English Language and Comparative Philology in Lafayette College, etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 254. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

This work is an honor to American scholarship, a valuable textbook for use and reference. Lafayette takes the lead of American

colleges in the scientific study of the English language. This is our first college to set apart time and funds for the philosophical study of our mother-tongue, and to unite comparative philology with English in a professorship, which enables the student to avail himself of the chief researches of the great German masters of philology. Professor March has enthusiastically toiled in this field, long deemed a wilderness of rocks and thorns, and in this work shows how an earnest, loving scholar can make it bloom. He has largely entered into the labors of Grimm, Bopp, Curtius, Grein, and many other German scholars, but he has notwithstanding produced a work that is his own, learned but not dull, comprehensive yet clear, full of facts yet methodically arranged, so that the student can advance through the forest without bewilderment. As far as we know this is the first original American work upon the subject, the college text-book generally used being the little English manual of Vernon. This is a thorough philological grammar, giving not only facts but their philosophy, and opening up vistas of philological relation through all the great Indo-European family, from the Sanscrit to the Lithuanic.

But though the Anglo-Saxon be the mother-speech from which sprang the English of Chaucer and Shakspeare, our interest in it is a purely scientific interest. Its study is a linguistic paleontology. Its literature is *dead* in a sense in which the epithet cannot be applied to the literatures of Greece and Rome. Alfred is farther off from us than Julius Cæsar; Caedman and Beowulf than Tacitus and Virgil. The rags and tatters of this worn-out language are reverently collected by enthusiastic philologists to find the threads from which our modern speech was woven, and that reverence and enthusiasm the student must share to enjoy this work of Professor March.

N.

Pamphlets.

As Regards Protoplasm, in Relation to Professor Huxley's Essay on the Physical Basis of Life. By JAMES HUTCHINSON STIRLING, F.R.C.S., and LL.D. (Edin.) Pp. 70. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1870. (No. 3, University Series.)

It is a signal proof of the brilliant genius and eminent standing of Professor Huxley that in one fortnight he was able to instal the term PROTOPLASM among the key-words of the English language and to fill the higher mind of England with excitement at its alarming import. The excitement has spread to this country, and nearly all our Quarterlies have furnished an article subjecting

Mr. Huxley's performance to the tests of criticism. The performance was a lecture delivered by him in one of the principal towns of England, in which he professed to have furnished the demonstration, as the final word of science, clothed in drapery of most gorgeous rhetoric, of the non-existence of mind except as a property of matter. The "Physical basis of life" is a certain material substance known to science as Protoplasm; and all thought is but the molecular motion of the protoplasmic particles. Stripped of all its variegated plumage of words and circumlocutions, the skeleton of the argument, according to our poor understanding, would be as follows—and if it is a very poor showing of logic we believe it to be no fault of ours:

Protoplasm, then, is demonstrably the "Physical basis of life" because it exists in all living beings, the one identical element, whether beings animal or vegetable, whether mosses or men. This Protoplasm consists chemically of the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. Now water is, we know, a compound of oxygen and hydrogen; and inasmuch as if you properly mix oxygen and hydrogen, and run an electric spark through them, you have *water*, so if you mix carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen under the influence of pre-existing protoplasm, you get *protoplasm*. Now when you thus get *water* you do not need to add to it verbally or mentally any such term or idea as *aquosity*; so when you thus get protoplasm you have no need to add any such word as *vitality*. All the properties of *aquosity* are embraced in the simple being of water; and all the properties of *vitality* (such as thought and voluntary motion) are embraced in the very being of protoplasm. In your cup you may hold a pint of water; in your fingers you may hold a pound of life.

To state this argument thus nakedly (and if you doubt the accuracy of our statement send twenty-five cents to Mr. Chatfield and he will send you a copy of the argument itself) is, if not to refute it, at least, we think, to show the absence of much need of refutation. It seems sufficient to say that there are immense quantities of *dead protoplasm*, but no such thing as *dry water*. If protoplasm is life, then lifeless protoplasm is lifeless life—that is, after you have got your protoplasm you need to have *vitality* added to it, just as you never need to add *aquosity* to water. Knock a man hard enough and you knock the *vitality* out of him, but not the protoplasm. The universality of protoplasm in all living organisms only proves that it is one of the necessary *conditions* of the visible manifestation of life in our physical world; it

does not prove it to be one of the necessary conditions of the existence of life in the Universe. Mr. Huxley's performance has not, perhaps, helped the cause of materialism forward one infinitesimal step.

If we rightly recollect, Mr. Stirling is a Scotch clergyman, and this pamphlet was originally published as an article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*. He is the author of a work entitled "The Secret of Hegel," which is said to be a profound exposition of the Hegelian philosophy. We query whether he is not the greatest metaphysician living. His present article we read with the same amazement at the affluence of its erudition and the masterly reach of its power that we experienced in first reading Sir William Hamilton's handling of Whately's Logic. One thing that surprises us is that, whereas the other answerers of Huxley have merely refuted his flimsy logic, Stirling has, with a giant scholarship and logic, riddled through and through his physiology, mastering the Professor on the very ground where he claims to be sole master. With his huge Scotch sledge-hammer he levels in shatters post after post of this physiological structure; and then with a razor of the finest edge makes a finish with the logic and metaphysics of protoplasmic Mr. Huxley. But it is not enough to say that there is nothing left of the Professor but a malodorous grease-spot; Stirling's article is a signal positive gain. Its constructive value as a putting of the psychological argument is permanent. Mr. Huxley has conquered Spiritualism as Louis Napoleon conquered Germany, and Hutchinson Stirling is his Wilhelm.

The Catholic World, July, 1870.

This periodical is, we believe, edited by Father Hecker, and, being endorsed by the Pope himself, may be quoted as an unquestionable authority for Romanistic views and purposes. It is ably conducted and generally presents the attractive side of Catholicism with great skill.

The July number contains an article which presents the views and aims of American Catholicism so frankly that we conclude to place some extracts from it on record for the possible future use of some of our readers. It is entitled "The Catholic of the Nineteenth Century."

1. *The American Catholic is to wield his vote for the purpose of securing Catholic ascendancy in this country.*

An offer and promise are as distinctly made to the Catholics of this age as they were to the chosen people when released from the Egyptian bondage. A land of

promise, a land flowing with milk and honey, is spread out before them, and offered for their acceptance. The means placed at their disposal for securing the rich possession are not the sword nor wars of extermination waged against the enemies of their religion, but, instead, the mild, and peaceful influence of the ballot, directed by instructed Catholic conscience and enlightened Catholic intelligence.

2. Legislation must be governed by the will of God unerringly indicated by the Pope.

All legislation in harmony with the organic law is theocratic and divine; all in violation or opposition, precisely in the measure and degree of departure, unjust, cruel, tyrannical, false, vain, unstable, and weak, and not entitled to respect or obedience. Since justice and our honor and dignity require that we should obey God and not man, we are compelled by every reasonable motive to ascertain his will. He does not communicate personally and orally with creatures. . . . The Catholic Church is the medium and channel through which the will of God is expressed. The chain of communication, composed of the triple strand of revelation, inspiration, and faith, stretches underneath the billows of eternity to the shore of time, from the throne of God to the chair of Peter. The finger of the Pope, like the needle in the compass, invariably points to the pole of eternal truth, and the mind of the Sovereign Pontiff is as certain to reflect the mind and will of God as the mirror at one end of a submarine cable to indicate the electric signal made at the other.

3. Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities; and under education the opinions of the individual and the utterances of the press are included, and wrong opinions are to be punished by the secular arm under authority of the Church, even to the extent of war and bloodshed.

The difficult and vexed question of mixed education obtrudes itself upon our attention at every step of a discussion like the one in which we are engaged. It is not our purpose to enter upon its details at present. The chief pastors in solemn council assembled will undoubtedly decide upon the line of conduct most expedient for us to follow. . . . The supremacy asserted for the Church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate function of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve or disapprove all books, publications, writings, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement. This is the principle upon which the Church has acted in handing over to the civil authority for punishment *criminals in the order of ideas*. It is the principle upon which every civilized government acts in emergencies, and it was asserted rigorously and unsparingly North and South during the recent revolution.

From all this we understand that the Romish spiritual power embraces in its scope also the temporal power; and thereby the Pope is the most absolute of all secular potentates. The American Catholic votes according to the decree and for the benefit of a foreign absolute sovereign. His oath to renounce all foreign jurisdiction is the most absolute perjury. He has, thence, no right to American citizenship. We also understand that when the secular arm has the power it is requirable by the Church to execute those who entertain views opposed to the Papacy; and that the only reason why the Church does not now require it is that the secular arm is not at the Pope's command. We finally understand that Catholics are ready and bound, when strong enough, to take

arms in behalf of these views and involve the country in conflicts as terrible as our late civil war. It is their weakness, not their will, that prevents.

Miscellaneous.

The Earth and its Wonders. In a series of Familiar Sketches. By Rev. CHARLES ADAMS, D.D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden.

A very successful attempt to invest science in graceful and popular style.

The Gospel of the Kingdom. A Kingdom not of this World, not in this World, but to come in the Heavenly Country; Of the Resurrection from the Dead, and of the Restitution of All Things. By SENIOR HARVARD. 8vo., pp. 463. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1870.

The Origin and Development of Religious Belief. By S. BARING GOULD, M.A., Author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," "The Silver Store," etc. Part I. Heathenism and Mosaism. Large 12mo., pp. 414. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. Large 12mo., pp. 192. London: Religious Tract Society.

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the Year MDCCCLXIX, on the Bampton Foundation. By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Large 12mo., pp. 397. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1870.

Sermons Preached at Brighton. By the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, the Incumbent of Trinity Chapel. With Portrait of the Author. New edition. Large 12mo., pp. 838. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The New Timothy. By WILLIAM M. BAKER. Author of "Inside," "Oak Mot," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 344. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Light-Houses and Light-Ships. A Descriptive and Historical Account of their Mode of Construction and Organization. By W. H. DAVENPORT ADAMS, Author of "Buried Cities of Campagna," "Queen of the Adriatic," etc., with Illustrations from Photographs and other sources. 12mo., pp. 322. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of the Human Body. From the French of A. LE PILEUR, Doctor of Medicine. Illustrated by forty-five Engravings, by LEVÉILLÉ. 12mo., pp. 256. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The History of Hortense, Daughter of the Empress Josephine, Queen of Holland, Mother of Napoleon III. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT, Author of "The French Revolution," "History of Napoleon Bonaparte," etc., with Engravings. 12mo., pp. 379. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Anna Lavater. A Picture of Swiss Pastoral Life in the Last Century. By Rev. W. LIETHE, Pastor of the Parochial Church, Berlin. Translated from the German by CATHARINE E. HURST. 12mo., pp. 226. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The True Unity of Christ's Church. Being a Renewed Appeal to the Friends of the Redeemer on Primitive Christian Union and the History of its Corruption, to which is now added a Modified Plan for the Reunion of all Evangelical Churches embracing as Integral parts the World's Evangelical Alliance, with all its National Branches. By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 262. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1870.

The Monks Before Christ. Their Spirit and their History. By JOHN EDGAR JOHNSON. 12mo., pp. 144. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1870.

- The United States Internal Revenue and Tariff Law.* Passed July 13, 1870. Together with the Acts imposing Taxes on Distilled Spirits and Tobacco and for other Purposes, (approved July 20, 1868,) and such other Acts or Parts of Acts relating to Internal Revenue as are now in effect, with Tables of Taxes, a copious Analytical Index and full Sectional Notes. Compiled by HORACE E. DRESSLER. 12mo., pp. 99. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- Saint Louis, the Future Great City of the World.* Illustrated with a Map. By L. W. REAVIS. 8vo., pp. 106. St. Louis: Published by order of the St. Louis County Court. 1870.
- The Whisky War in Adrian;* or, the Trials and Triumphs of Prohibition in Lenawee County, Michigan. A Discourse delivered at the M. E. Church in Adrian, Michigan, July 17, 1870, by Rev. J. S. SMART. 12mo., pp. 33. Published and for sale by J. M. Arnold & Co., Detroit, Michigan.
- History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada.* By THOMAS WEBSTER. 12mo., pp. 424. Hamilton. 1870.
- Recollections of Eton.* By an Etonian. With Illustrations by Sydney P. Hall. 8vo., paper, pp. 126. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- The Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Annual Reports of the Officers of the Retreat for the Insane at Hartford, Connecticut.* April, 1870. 12mo., pp. 35. Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Brainard.
- A Memoir of Rev. Jacob Ward,* a Local Elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. ALFRED BRUNSON, A.M., D.D. 16mo., pp. 20. La Crosse, Wis.: W. W. Ustick. 1870.
- Speeches, Letters and Sayings of Charles Dickens.* With Sketch of the Author by GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA, and Sermon by DEAN STANLEY. 8vo., pp. 147. Paper cover. Harper and Brothers. 1870.
- Charles Dickens.* The Story of his Life by the Author of the "Life of Thackeray," with Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 110. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- * Fiction.
- Veronica.* A Novel. By the Author of "Aunt Margaret's Troubles." 12mo., pp. 175. New York, 1870.
- The Genial Showman:* being a Reminiscence of Artemus Ward, and Pictures of a Showman's Career in the Western World. By EDWARD P. HINGSTON. 12mo., pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- True to Herself.* A Romance. By F. W. ROBINSON, Author of "Stern Necessity," "Poor Humanity," etc. 8vo., paper, pp. 173. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- Gwendoline's Harvest.* A Novel. By the Author of "Carlyon's Year," "Found Dead," etc. 12mo., pp. 85. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- Stern Necessity.* A Novel. By T. W. ROBINSON. 12mo., pp. 154. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- So Runs the World Away.* A Novel. By Mrs. A. C. STEEL, Author of "Garden-hurst." 12mo., pp. 145. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- Kilmory.* By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "In Silk Attire," "Love or Marriage." 12mo., pp. 136. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- John.* A Love Story. By Mrs. OLIPHANT, Author of "Agnes," "Carlingford," "The Minister's Wife," etc. 12mo., pp. 110. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.
- The Writings of Anna Isabel Thackeray.* With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 425. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

INDEX.

Abbott, Jacob: The Juno Stories.....	Page 488	Clark, R. W.: The Questions of the Hour: The Bible and the School Fund.....	Page 322
Abbott, J. S. C.: The History of Hortense.....	149	Clyde: Under Foot.....	321
— The Romance of Spanish History.....	149	Cocker: Christianity and Greek Philosophy.....	460
Abbott, L.: Old Testament Shadows of New Testament Truths.....	161	Coleman, L.: The Apostolical and Primitive Church; Popular in its Government, Informal in its Worship.....	298
Abbott, R.: The Young Detective.....	163	Comfort: A German Course.....	317
Adams, Dr.: The Earth and its Wonders.....	635	Coming of Christ in his Kingdom, etc.....	315
Adams, W.: Light-Houses and Light-Ships.....	632	Congregational Quarterly.....	602
Alexander: Joseph Addison, Life of.....	152	— Review.....	602
Alone in London.....	162	Contributors, Notice to.....	324
American Annals of Deaf and Dumb.....	416	Cooly: A Text-Book of Chemistry.....	162
American Presbyterian Review.....	290, 455	Cowles: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, with Notes.....	482
Anderssen: In Spain, and a Visit to Portugal.....	483	Crane: Popular Amusements.....	132
Annual Reports, 45 and 46, of the Retreat for the Insane at Hartford, Conn.....	686		
Architecture, Wonders of.....	473	D'Aubigne: History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin.....	151
Arnot: Life of James Hamilton, D.D., F.R.S.....	322	Day: Two Reports on the Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in Europe, etc.....	416
Atonement of Jesus Christ—What is it?.....	159	Deems and Carey: Hymns for all Christians.....	162
		De Groot on Gnostic Testimonies to the New Testament.....	485
Baker: The New Timothy.....	635	Basilides.....	486
Baltzer: Gott, Welt, und Mensch, etc.....	619	Use of the Writings of the New Testa- ment by Basilides.....	488
Baptist Quarterly Review.....	124, 290, 455, 601	Use of the Writings of the New Testament among the oldest Gnostics.....	491
Barclay: Apology for the True Christian Di- vinity, as held forth by the Quakers.....	297	Use of the New Testament by Valentinus.....	494
Barker: The Correlation of Physical and Vital Forces.....	477	Do the Citations from the Writings of the New Testament really proceed from the oldest Gnostics.....	503
Bazar Book of Decorum, The.....	483	Department of Public Instruction, Chicago.....	334
Beck: Leitfaden der christlichen Glaubens- lehre für Kirche, Schule, und Haus.....	466	De Pressensé: Rome and Italy, etc.....	293
Beecher: Principles of Domestic Science.....	515	— The Early Years of Christianity.....	611
Beggar on Horse-back, A, etc.....	162	Des Aïten Nikolaus Hundins Glaubenslehre der Evangelischen Lutherischen Kirche.....	464
Beneath the Wheels.....	160	Dewart: Songs of Life, Poems.....	318
Berean Lessons for 1870, The.....	618	Dickens, Dialogues from.....	324
Beyer: Friedrich Rückert.....	618	— The Story of his Life, etc.....	636
Bible better than the Œcumenical Council.....	84	Did the "Church South" Secede?.....	243
"Liberal Church" notion exploded.....	84	"Plan of Separation".....	243
General Councils divided and heterodox.....	87	Report of the Committee of Nine on Division of the Church, Journal of General Conference, 1844.....	245
The Bible just what man needs.....	88	1. Adoption of Policy proposed by Report purely an Act of Grace on the part of the Northern Majority.....	247
It embraces the grandest subjects.....	91	2. This Report not a "Compact".....	248
Claim of Councils to represent the Chris- tian world absurd.....	94	3. The General Conference did not divide the Church.....	250
Bible in the Public Schools, The.....	317	4. The General Conference created no Division—had no Power to Divide.....	232
Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review.....	290, 455, 601	5. General Conference had no Intention, gave no consent, to divide the Church.....	258
Bibliotheca Sacra.....	124, 291, 456, 601	6. Secession, violent or peaceful, a prede- termined fact by the South.....	254
Bickersteth: The Spirit of Life, etc.....	323, 635	7. Act of Secession first committed by the Louisville Convention.....	257
Bierbower: Principles of Philosophy.....	307	8. "Plan of Separation" abundantly vio- lated by the South in its boundaries.....	258
Bill: A Winter in Florida, etc.....	150	9. Assuming Report a "Compact," parties framing it mutually bound.....	259
Bird: The Black Man, etc.....	151	10. Report enacted in case South separa- ted, the M. E. Church to refrain from pastoral acts within given territory.....	260
Bismarck, The Life of, etc.....	483	Discipline of Alice Lee, The.....	163
Black: Kilmory.....	636	Disraeli: Lothair.....	484
Bonar: Light and Truth, etc.....	823	Dixon: Free Russia.....	629
Bound to John Company, etc.....	161	Doomed City, The.....	163
Boutwell: Arms and Armor in Antiquity and the Middle Ages.....	161	Draper: History of American Civil War.....	476
Bowen: American Political Economy.....	482	Dressler, Compiled by: The United States Internal Revenue and Tariff Law.....	686
Brake Up; or, The Young Peace-makers.....	324		
Brave Lady, A.....	484		
British and Foreign Evangelical Review.....	125, 292, 457, 602		
British Quarterly Review.....	128, 292, 602		
Brooke: Sermons.....	137		
Brown: Miscrad Passages of Scripture.....	136		
— The Divine Mysteries.....	135		
Buck: Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ.....	136		
Burns, Memoir of the Rev. Wm. C.....	322		
Burr: Pater Mundl.....	483		
Bushnell: Nature and the Supernatural, etc.....	29		
Catholic World, The.....	688		
Christian Quarterly.....	124, 290, 456, 601		
Christ is Coming.....	162		
Clarke: Institution for Deaf-Mutes, Reports.....	416		

Du Challa: Lost in the Jungle.....	Page 162	Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, etc.....	Page 149
Duke of Argyll: Reign of Law.....	29	Hazard: Two Letters on Causation and Freedom in Willing.....	189
Eadie: Paul the Preacher, etc.....	137	Heard: The Tripartite Nature of Man, etc.	306
Edinburgh Review.....	126, 292, 457, 603	Henderson: Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.	482
Edwards: Debenham's Vow.....	484	Himes: Some of the Methods and Results of Observation of the Total Eclipse of the Sun, Aug. 7, 1869.....	324
— Kitty.....	323	Hingston: The Genial Showman, etc.....	636
Ellot, George: Felix Holt, the Radical.....	162	Hirell.....	323
— Romola.....	163	History of Methodism, An Appendix to Dr. Jacoby's new.....	265
— The Mill on the Floss.....	162	Hitchcock's New Monthly Magazine.....	163
Episcopal Visitation for 1870: Plan of.....	164	Holiday: Bible Hand-Book.....	127
Ethics of Latin Comedy, The.....	562	Holy Scripture a Divine Revelation.....	45
Comedy a fine Setting for Ethics.....	563	Sufficient Proof for Believers.....	47
Prevailing Notions of the Age.....	564	Innate Religion a Fiction.....	30
A Supreme Being recognized.....	564	Scriptures Divinely Human.....	54
Correctness of moral sentiment of Romans	568	Objection that Scriptures do not Harmon- ize with recent Discoveries in Natu- ral Science answered.....	61
A Broad Gulf between Theoretical and Practical Virtue.....	570	The Scripture has Fulfilled all it Promised	63
Evangelical Quarterly Review.....	124, 290, 602	Home Influence.....	484
Evans: The Christian Doctrine of Marriage.	607	Home Life: How to make Home Happy.....	322
Fault Finding.—Madeline Hascall's Letters	163	Hood: Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets.....	162
Finley: The Constitution of Man, etc.....	139	How Charley Roberts became a Man.....	163
Fisher: Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, etc.....	298	How Eva Roberts gained her Education.....	168
Folsom: The Four Gospels.....	324	Human Body, Wonders of the.....	473
Foreign Literary Intelligence.....	123, 288, 453	Inquiry into the Meaning and Aim of Mat- thew xxiv, 1-36.....	350
Belgium.....	455	The stand-point of Jesus and his Disci- ples.....	350
France.....	454	The question, as the disciples intended it.	352
Germany.....	123, 288, 453	Its meaning, as they stated it.....	353
Foreign Religious Intelligence, 118, 285, 448, 598		The answer of Jesus.....	354
Eastern Churches, The.....	121	"Take heed that no man deceive you.".....	355
Protestantism.....	118, 288	The signs of his coming foretold.....	360
Roman Catholicism.....	119, 285, 448, 598	Italian Art, Wonders of.....	473
Poster: New Cyclopædia of Illustrations.....	463	Janvier: Agnes Morton's Trial, etc.....	322
Freedmen's Aid Society of the M. E. C.....	321	Johnson: The Monks before Christ.....	635
Free-will Baptist Quarterly.....	124, 290	Jones: Elements of the Hebrew Language.....	482
Froude: History of England, etc.....	151, 322	Josephus and Apion.....	274
Gallandet: Methods of Instruction in Deaf and Dumb Institutions of Europe.....	416	Birth and education of Josephus.....	275
Garbett: The Dogmatic Faith, etc.....	133	Conflict between Jews and Romans.....	277
General Conference of 1844.....	165	Works of Josephus.....	277
Slavery marked for "Extirpation".....	165	Apion's attack upon the "Antiquities".....	277
Conservative Progressive Party.....	169	— His account of the origin of the Jew- ish Sabbath.....	278
Dr. Elliott on a Slave-holding Bishop.....	172	Josephus shows the absurdities of Apion.....	279
Quotation from Rev. W. A. Smith, of Va.	172	Judd: Wesleyan University Records.....	189
Four questions before the Conference.....	173	Kellogg, Rev. E.: Elm Island Stories.....	483
Was Bishop Andrew's case exceptional?.....	174	— The Boy Farmers of Elm Island.....	163
Resolution requesting his resignation.....	177	Kelly: Proverbs of all Nations.....	162
Substitute to preceding resolution.....	179	Kimmont: Household Stories.....	322
"Compromise Law" on Slavery.....	182	Kingsley: Round the World.....	628
Dr. Capers' Proposition.....	186	Kitt's Bible Illustrations.....	187
Glass-making in all Ages, Wonders of.....	478	Kraunmacher, Friedrich Wilhelm.....	161
Goddard: Baffled, etc.....	484	Lane's Bibelwerk.....	297
God is Love, etc.....	484	Lange: Epistle of Paul to the Romans.....	130
Godwin: Adventures of Caleb Williams.....	328	Laurentie: L'Athéisme Scientifique.....	5
Goulbourn: The Pursuit of Holiness, etc.....	102	Lea: Studies in Church-History, etc.....	315
Gould: The Origin and Development of Re- ligious Belief.....	635	Letters: The Hebrew Bible.....	299
Gracey, S. L.: Anniversary Gems.....	323	Life and Alone.....	483
Gray, J. C.: Topics for Teachers.....	324	Living Thoughts.....	162
Greenwood: Wild Sports of the World.....	162	London Quarterly Review.....	128, 292, 457, 603
Grey: Journal of a Visit to Egypt, etc.....	323	Lord, John: Ancient States and Empires.....	161
Gwendoline's Harvest.....	686	Lord, J. L.: Jesus on the Throne of his Father David, etc.....	323
Hagenbach: History of the Church, etc.....	147	— The Promise of Shiloh, etc.....	162
Hall: Health by Good Living.....	322	Lorimer: Among the Trees.....	162
Hamilton: Sermons of B. Winter.....	296	Lyll: Principles of Geology.....	324
Hanna: The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth.....	316	Lytton: The Odes and Epodes of Horace.....	29
— The Life of our Lord.....	464	McCabe: Planting of the Wilderness, etc.....	163
— The Ministry in Galilee.....	322	McCarthy: My Enemy's Daughter.....	162
Harcourt: Rambles through the British Isles, etc.....	316		
Harkness: Cæsar's Commentaries, etc.....	483		
Hart: Removing Mountains, etc.....	322		
Hartwig: The Polar World, etc.....	150		
Harvard: The Gospel of the Kingdom.....	635		
Haven: National Sermons.....	189		

- M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia...Page 463
 M'Cosh: Laws of Discursive Thought, etc. 467
 MacGregor, D.: Shepherd of Israel, etc. 162
 MacGregor, J.: Rob Roy on the Jordan, etc. 680
 March, F. A.: A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language, etc. 630
 M'Tyler: A Manual of Discipline of the M. E. Church, South, etc. 483
 Marion and Jessie. 484
 Marshall: Sabbath Songs, etc. 163
 Marsh, G. P.: Man and Nature. 29
 Martineau: Essays, Philosophical, etc. 29
 Massachusetts Board of State Charities. 416
 Mathematics as an Educational Instrument. 65
 Preliminary View. 65
 Mathematics Defined and Classified. 66
 The Mathematical Field Broad. 71
 Utility of its Practical Applications. 72
 Certain Objections to its Study Answered. 74
 Maunier: Book of Religious Instruction. 163
 May: Dotty Dimple's Flyaway. 163
 Mercersburg Review. 124, 290
 Metcalf: Letter and Spirit. 323
 Methodist Hymn Book and its Associations. 423
 Plan of the Work. 423
 Instances of Want of Candor, etc. 445
 Meunier: Adventures on the Great Hunting Grounds of the World. 163
 Ministerial Transfers. 235
 Preachers restricted by Conferences. 235
 Transfers would Facilitate the Arrangement of Appointments. 237
 More extended Transfers would tend to Maintain the Unity of Methodism. 237
 Circulatory System favorable to the Development of the Men. 240
 Feasible Plan for Transfers. 243
 Minister, The Earnest vs. The Easy. 397
 Earnestness in Personal Piety the Basis. 399
 Theological Schools. 401
 Pastoral Work. 405
 The Easy Minister described. 409
 His Preparations for the Pulpit. 410
 His Pastoral Work. 412
 Minutes of the Conference for 1868-9. 235
 — of First S. S. Convention of the S. S. U. of the Baltimore Conference. 163
 Miss Van Kortland. 484
 Milford, The Life of Mary Russell. 324
 Mommson's Rome. 148, 317, 323, 325, 485
 Mommson a follower of Niebuhr. 327
 Origin, Relationships, and Early Fortunes of the Primitive Races. 329
 Rome's Progress in the Arts of Life. 333
 Two Carthaginian Wars and other Wars. 340
 Rome unable to govern itself. 343
 Roman treatment of Slave-laborers. 345
 Monk: Hymns, Ancient and Modern, etc. 162
 Mounier, Marc: Wonders of Pompeii. 323
 Murray: Music-Hall Sermons. 299
 Muscovite and the Teuton, The. 510
 Controlling influence of the German element in Russian affairs. 510
 War between the German and Russian elements. 511
 German Diligence and Learning useful to Russia. 513
 Plan to Russialize the Baltic Provinces. 516
 Nast, Dr. Note from. 454
 Naville: Life Eternal. 609
 — The Heavenly Father. 609
 New Englander. 290, 456, 602
 New England Historical and Genealogical Register. 125, 602
 Newman: An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent. 462
 New York Institution for Deaf and Dumb. 416
 North American Review. 125, 290, 456, 602
 North British Review. 125, 292, 457, 603
 Olliphant, John. Page 636
 Olliphant: The Minister's Wife. 162
 Only Himself. 323
 Oriental Influence on Western Thought, etc. 545
 Achievements of the Alexandrian School. 546
 Pernicious System of Monachism. 545
 Revenue of the Moors—Their Learning. 552
 Some Striking Results of the Crusades. 553
 Influence of the Jewish Race. 556
 Influence of the Commerce of the East. 558
 Orton: The Andes and the Amazon, etc. 315
 Osborn: Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography. 316
 Our Spoken English. 526
 These Americanisms not a Dialect. 526
 Loss and Renewal of Sounds of Language. 530
 Deficiency of our Written Notation. 531
 Dialectic Abbreviations. 535
 Independence of the Eye. 540
 Palestine, The Relief Map of. 324
 Pearson: The Cabin on the Prairie. 163
 Peck, Ira B.: A Genealogical History of the Descendants of Joseph Peck, etc. 316
 Peirece: Young Shetlander and his Home. 317
 Perowne: Immortality. 290
 Politics and the Pulpit. 159
 National Sermons by Gilbert Haven. 159
 Historic Value of these Sermons. 190
 Their Prophetic Character. 191
 Their Rhetorical Excellence. 192
 Their Evangelical Philanthropy. 193
 Caste Antagonistic to the Law of Progress. 197
 Pope and the Council, The, by Janus. 308
 Popular Library for Young People. 322, 433
 Power of Mind over Nature. On the. 29, 221
 1. Power of Man in Modifying the Physical Geography of the Globe. 36
 2. Influence of Mind on the Physiognomy of the Earth. 40
 3. Influence of Mind on Physique of Man. 42
 4. Power of Mind to Control the Mechanical Forces of Nature, etc. 221
 5. Influence which Man exerts over the Vegetable Life of the Globe. 224
 6. Influence of Man on the Physical Development, Habits, etc., of Animals. 226
 Prescott: The Prescott Memorial. 306
 Princeton Review. 125
 Quarterly Book-Table. 180, 293, 460, 604
 Ramesis the Great. 144
 Ratzinger: Kirchlichen Armenpflege. 617
 Reule: The Cloister and the Hearth, etc. 162
 Reavis: Saint Louis, the future Great City of the World. 636
 Recollections of Eton. 636
 Reid, Rev. John: Sorrow. 162
 Renan, Ernest. 5
 His Professorship of Hebrew in the College of France. 6
 His "Life of Jesus". 6
 His Birth and Education. 7
 His Theological Training. 8
 He rejects the Supernatural. 16
 Renan's Idea of Immortality. 22
 Report of Board of State Commissioners of Public Charities of the State of N. Y. 163
 Revue Chretienne. (Christian Review). 429
 Revue Theologique. (Theological Review). 429
 Robertson: Sermons Preached at Brighton. 635
 Robinson: Stern Necessity. 636
 — True to Himself. 636
 Romanism and the Common School System. 204
 — assails the Common School system. 207
 Desecration of the Public Money in New York City by the Romanist Party. 209
 Necessary Preparations for the Contest. 217
 Duties of the Clergy on this Subject. 218
 Ryle: Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. 223

Sacred Poets, Evening with the.....Page 477	Twenty-Second Psalm: The Psalm Class-
Sainte-Beuve: <i>Nouveaux Lundis</i> 5	ified.....Page 93
Sawtine: <i>Dame Nature and her Three</i>	Describes Christ's Agony in the Garden. 99
Daughters..... 163	His Agony upon the Cross.....104, 374
Schaff: <i>History of the Apostolic Church</i> ... 313	The Description cannot apply to David.. 106
Schmid: <i>Der Kampf der Luthertischen</i>	Describes Christ's Victory.....109, 374
<i>Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abend-</i>	Inspiration and Revelation defined..... 366
<i>mahl im Reformationszeitalter, etc.</i> ... 301	Methods adopted to communicate Super-
Schmucker: <i>True Unity of Christ's Church</i> . 635	natural Truths..... 369
Schuyler: <i>Logic for High Schools, etc.</i> 467	Revelations are Objective and Subjective. 370
Scripture, Inspiration of all..... 116	When the Psalm was written..... 375
The True Interpretation of 2 Tim. III, 16,	Universalist Quarterly.....125, 291, 456, 603
stated and argued..... 110	Unkind Word, The, and other Stories..... 323
Plenary Inspiration not a Question in	Upham, F. W.: Who they Were, and How
Paul's Time..... 113	they Came to Jerusalem..... 464
The True Inspiration assumed..... 113	Upham, T. C.: <i>Mental Philosophy, etc.</i> 472
Every Part of Inspired Scripture valuable 114	Urin: <i>Wesley's Place in Church-history</i> ... 311
Shedd: <i>A History of Christian Doctrine</i> ... 482	Verdi: <i>Maternity</i> 626
— <i>Homiletics and Pastoral Theology</i> ... 482	Veronica..... 636
Silver Tongue and Organist's Repertory... 163	Vick's <i>Illustrated Catalogue and Floral</i>
Simmons: <i>A Scripture Manual</i> 161	<i>Guide</i> 323
Smart: <i>The Whisky War in Adrian, etc.</i> ... 636	Waddell: <i>Greek Grammar for Beginners</i> ... 162
Smiles: <i>Self-Help, etc.</i> 483	Wallace: <i>Contributions to the Theory of</i>
Smith: <i>Prophecy, a Preparation for Christ</i> , 604, 635	<i>Natural Selection</i> 629
Southern General Conference, The..... 480	Ward, <i>A Memoir of Rev. Jacob</i> 635
Southern Methodist Press, The.....154, 319	Waterbury: <i>Memoir of Rev. J. Scudder, M.D</i> 482
Southern Reconstruction, Its Obstacles, etc.	Weber und Holtzmann: <i>Geschichte des</i>
Pride of Character and of Consistency... 380	<i>Volkes Israel und der Entstehung des</i>
"Social Equality" feared..... 822	<i>Christenthums</i> 133
Southern Spirit in the Sanctuary..... 886	Webster: <i>History of M. E. Church in Canada</i> 636
Treatment of Colored Laborers..... 859	Weiss: <i>Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie, etc</i> 362
Feelings toward Immigrants from the	Wells: <i>Wedlock, etc.</i> 192
North..... 391	Wesley's Separation from the Moravians... 265
Spanish Barber, The, <i>A Tale of the Bible</i>	Causes of his Separation..... 265
<i>in Spain</i> 163	Letter to the Society in Herrnhut..... 266
Stanley: <i>Lectures on the History of the</i>	Attempts at Reconciliation..... 266
<i>Eastern Church</i> 151	Conversation between Zinzendorf and
— <i>Lectures on History of Jewish Church</i> . 151	Wesley..... 267
Stayman: <i>Flowers and Fossils, etc.</i> 323	Manifesto of the Moravian Society at Ma-
Steel: <i>So Runs the World away</i> 636	rienborn..... 270
Steinmeyer: <i>Apologetische Beiträge</i> 299	Diversities of Doctrine and Aim..... 273
Sterling: <i>As regards Protoplasm, in relation</i>	Westminster Review.....126, 292, 457, 603
to Prof. Huxley's Essay on the Physical	Whately: <i>Essays on some of the Peculiar-</i>
Basis of Life..... 631	<i>ities of the Christian Religion</i> 463
Stone: <i>The Invitation He died. Reasons</i>	Williams: <i>The Gospel according to Matthew</i> 265
<i>for a Return to Catholic Unity</i> 473	Wilson: <i>Our Father in Heaven, etc.</i> 482
Storrs: <i>God is Love. A Sermon</i> 159	Winchell: <i>Sketches of Creation, etc</i> 303
— <i>The Judgment, etc.</i> 159	Wolfe: <i>Out in the World</i> 433
Studien und Kritiken..... 129, 292, 458	Wonders of the Human Body..... 635
Sublime in Nature, The..... 473	Wood, Rev. J. G.: <i>Bible Animals</i> 139
Sun, The..... 473	Woolsey: <i>Essay on Divorce, etc.</i> 607
Thayer: <i>Classical Study</i> 484	Word, The, etc..... 482
Tennyson, The Poetical Works of..... 323	Wuttke on Greek Ethics..... 573
Textual Corrections of the Common English	Plato: <i>General Principles</i> 573
Version in the New Testament..... 462	Basis and Nature of Virtue..... 574
Thackeray, The Writings of Anna Isabel... 636	The Four Platonic Virtues..... 577
The "B. O. W. C." <i>A Book for Boys</i> ... 323	The Platonic State..... 578
Theological Medium..... 290	The Platonic Family..... 580
Thomson: <i>Our Oriental Missions</i> 626	Caste..... 581
Todd: <i>The Sunset Land, etc.</i> 161	Ethical Progress..... 582
Tom Brown's School-days..... 484	Religious Defectiveness..... 584
Tourjee: <i>The Tone Masters</i> 323	Artistic: <i>General Principles</i> 585
Trafton: <i>Baptism—Its Subject and Mode</i> ... 323	Nature and Kinds of Virtue..... 587
Training of Deaf-Mutes..... 416	Defectiveness of the Just-mean Principle. 589
Difficulties in teaching Deaf-Mutes..... 417	The several Virtues..... 590
Abbe de l'Epée's System..... 418	Solidarity..... 593
Origin of American System of Deaf-Mute	The State..... 594
Instruction..... 420	Slavery..... 594
Pedro Fonce de Leon: <i>Teacher of Articulation to Deaf-Mutes</i> 422	Greek Ethics at its highest..... 595
Jacob R. Pereira taught Mutes to read	Yates: <i>Wrecked in Port</i> 162
audibly..... 424	Yonge: <i>An English-Greek Lexicon</i> 476
John Paul Bonet, <i>Constructor of Mute</i>	Youmans: <i>The First Book of Botany</i> 483
Alphabet..... 424	Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie... 293, 479
True Stories of Real Pets..... 163	Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 293
Twenty-Second Psalm, The, as Illustrating	
the Subjective Method of Prophetic	
Christological Revelation..... 95, 360	

